

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY



119 009

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY

THE PEOPLES' PEACE

THE PEOPLES' PEACE

By
REPRESENTATIVES
OF THE
UNITED NATIONS



GEORGE W. STEWART, PUBLISHER, INC.

New York, N. Y.

By GEORGE W. STEWART, PUBLISHER, INC.

all rights reserved. This book, or parts thereof, may
not be reproduced in any form without
permission of the publisher.

MANUFACTURED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
BY THE CORNWALL PRESS, CORNWALL, N. Y.

PUBLISHER'S FOREWORD

A beneficial peace program can be made only if the public is aware of the issues involved and if it courageously directs its leaders to act for the common welfare of the countless millions of people who have been helping to preserve its own freedom.

The present volume attempts to review many of these issues by bringing together the opinions of official and unofficial representatives of many of the United Nations. Without editorial suggestion or persuasion the contributors to these discussions were asked either to express their own opinions or reflect as conscientiously as they could the attitudes of their fellow nationals. The book thus, in a manner of speaking, brings the reader to a discussion table where his fellow-allies say what they think we are all fighting for, what we want to bring about and why we must co-operate for peace as for war. If these opinions reveal the important issues the book will benefit the reader. If they reveal the urgency of co-operative planning now they will benefit everyone.

The unity of the United Nations is an accepted military necessity. But this same war-time unity has created an unprecedented opportunity for the free peoples of the world to collaborate in establishing the agencies that will further integrate this society of nations to deal with the more complex problems of the peace and the reconstruction.

Many of our leaders have urged us to plan for the peace now, now while the war stresses our common need for survival. Before our co-operating armies take over enemy-held territory it becomes clear that we must agree upon an integrated peace program in which each nation can begin to take its part as it is liberated from enemy occupation.

We wish to express our gratitude to the authors of these articles who willingly gave precious time to write for this collection or to choose articles or addresses previously made public which might best express their conscientious opinions. We also thank the many others who have been helpful in collecting this material.

THE PUBLISHER

CONTENTS

THE ATLANTIC CHARTER— <i>Franklin D. Roosevelt and Winston Churchill</i>	9
BELGIUM AND THE PEACE— <i>Frans J. Van Cauwel- aert</i>	11
CHINA EMERGENT— <i>Mme. Chiang Kai-shek</i> . . .	24
THE CZECHOSLOVAK REPUBLIC AND THE DEMO- CRATIC WAY OF LIFE IN CENTRAL EUROPE— <i>Jan Masaryk</i>	35
STATEMENTS BY FIGHTING FRENCH LEADERS— <i>Gen- eral Charles de Gaulle, René Cassin, André Philip</i> . . . ,	42
FUTURE DEPENDS ON THE RESTORATION OF THE FOUR FREEDOMS— <i>Anthony Eden</i>	55
NECESSARY FUNDAMENTALS— <i>Anthony Eden</i> . . .	61
SACRIFICES FOR PEACE— <i>Anthony Eden</i>	67
SCIENTISTS AND CONSTRUCTION OF POST-WAR WORLD— <i>Sir Stafford Cripps</i>	73
THE BRITISH LABOR PARTY'S PLAN TO WIN THE PEACE	85
WAR AND PEACE— <i>André Michalopoulos</i> . . .	95
THE FUNDAMENTALS OF LASTING PEACE— <i>Sir Mu- hammed Zafrulla Khan</i>	104

INDIA AND THE PEACE— <i>Anup Singh</i>	118
EASTERN EUROPE AWAITS A COMMON MAN'S PEACE — <i>Savo N. Kosanovich</i>	128
MEXICO AND PAN AMERICANISM— <i>Ezequiel Padilla</i>	137
TOWARD A NETHERLANDS COMMONWEALTH— <i>Queen Wilhelmina</i>	141
THE ROAD TOWARDS THE FOUR FREEDOMS— <i>Pieter Gerbrandy</i>	146
A PEACE WITH SECURITY AND ADVENTURE— <i>Walter Nash</i>	152
A NORWEGIAN POINT OF VIEW— <i>Edvard Hambro</i>	170
THE MEANING OF A PACIFIC CHARTER— <i>Joaquin M. Elizalde</i>	184
THE SIGHTS ARE SET— <i>Stefan de Ropp</i>	191
THE FREE SPIRIT OF MAN OR FOUL OPPRESSION— <i>Jan Christiaan Smuts</i>	198
SOVIET WAR AIMS— <i>Joseph Stalin</i>	204
"THE FOUR FREEDOMS"— <i>Franklin D. Roosevelt</i>	210
FOUNDATION OF THE PEACE— <i>Henry A. Wallace</i> . .	211
A TRIBUTE TO RUSSIA— <i>Henry A. Wallace</i> . . .	229
A MEMORIAL DAY ADDRESS— <i>Sumner Welles</i> . .	237
WINNING THE WAR AFTER THE WAR— <i>Milo Perkins</i>	247
AMERICA'S REAL TASK— <i>Wendell L. Willkie</i> . .	254
REPORT TO THE PEOPLE— <i>Wendell L. Willkie</i> . .	262

THE ATLANTIC CHARTER

The President of the United States and the Prime Minister, Mr. Churchill, representing his Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom, being met together, deem it right to make known certain common principles in the national policies of their respective countries on which they base their hopes for a better future for the world.

1. Their countries seek no aggrandizement, territorial or other.
2. They desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned.
3. They respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of Government under which they will live; and they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them.
4. They will endeavor, with due respect for their existing obligations, to further enjoyment by all States, great or small, victor or vanquished, of access, on equal terms, to the trade and to the raw materials of the world which are needed for their economic prosperity.
5. They desire to bring about the fullest collaboration between all nations in the economic field, with the object of securing for all improved labor

INDIA AND THE PEACE— <i>Anup Singh</i>	118
EASTERN EUROPE AWAITS A COMMON MAN'S PEACE — <i>Savo N. Kosanovich</i>	128
MEXICO AND PAN AMERICANISM— <i>Ezequiel Padilla</i>	137
TOWARD A NETHERLANDS COMMONWEALTH— <i>Queen Wilhelmina</i>	141
THE ROAD TOWARDS THE FOUR FREEDOMS— <i>Pieter Gerbrandy</i>	146
A PEACE WITH SECURITY AND ADVENTURE— <i>Walter Nash</i>	152
A NORWEGIAN POINT OF VIEW— <i>Edvard Hambro</i>	170
THE MEANING OF A PACIFIC CHARTER— <i>Joaquin M. Elizalde</i>	184
THE SIGHTS ARE SET— <i>Stefan de Ropp</i>	191
THE FREE SPIRIT OF MAN OR FOUL OPPRESSION— <i>Jan Christiaan Smuts</i>	198
SOVIET WAR AIMS— <i>Joseph Stalin</i>	204
"THE FOUR FREEDOMS"— <i>Franklin D. Roosevelt</i>	210
FOUNDATION OF THE PEACE— <i>Henry A. Wallace</i> . .	211
A TRIBUTE TO RUSSIA— <i>Henry A. Wallace</i> . . .	229
A MEMORIAL DAY ADDRESS— <i>Sumner Welles</i> . .	237
WINNING THE WAR AFTER THE WAR— <i>Milo Perkins</i>	247
AMERICA'S REAL TASK— <i>Wendell L. Willkie</i> . .	254
REPORT TO THE PEOPLE— <i>Wendell L. Willkie</i> . .	262

THE ATLANTIC CHARTER

The President of the United States and the Prime Minister, Mr. Churchill, representing his Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom, being met together, deem it right to make known certain common principles in the national policies of their respective countries on which they base their hopes for a better future for the world.

1. Their countries seek no aggrandizement, territorial or other.
2. They desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned.
3. They respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of Government under which they will live; and they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them.
4. They will endeavor, with due respect for their existing obligations, to further enjoyment by all States, great or small, victor or vanquished, of access, on equal terms, to the trade and to the raw materials of the world which are needed for their economic prosperity.
5. They desire to bring about the fullest collaboration between all nations in the economic field, with the object of securing for all improved labor

standards, economic advancement and social security.

6. After the final destruction of Nazi tyranny, they hope to see established a peace which will afford to all nations the means of dwelling in safety within their own boundaries, and which will afford assurance that all the men in all the lands may live out their lives in freedom from fear and want.
7. Such a peace should enable all men to traverse the high seas and oceans without hindrance.
8. They believe all of the nations of the world, for realistic as well as spiritual reasons, must come to the abandonment of the use of force. Since no future peace can be maintained if land, sea, or air armaments continue to be employed by nations which threaten, or may threaten, aggression outside of their frontiers, they believe, pending the establishment of a wider and permanent system of general security, that the disarmament of such nations is essential. They will likewise aid and encourage all other practicable measures which will lighten for peace-loving peoples the crushing burden of armament.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT
WINSTON S. CHURCHILL

BELGIUM

Belgium and the Peace

By DR. FRANS J. VAN CAUWELAERT, *Speaker of the Belgian Chamber of Deputies.*

Belgium's war aims can be summed up in a few words: restoration of her independence; guarantees of her frontiers; maintenance of her colonial empire; and the benefits of an international economic order which will allow her to reap the rewards of honest labor.

In addition to these aims, Belgium hopes that there will be an equitable distribution of war indemnities which will enable her to repair the damages inflicted upon her and contribute to the rebuilding of her economic life.

There is nothing in that idea at variance with the strictest notions of justice; nothing that stands in the way of the swift reconstruction of international order or of the establishment of the whole world on the broadest bases of right and good will among men.

After the war of 1914-1918, Belgium enjoyed in some measure the advantage of priorities in respect to war indemnities. This was not simply due to gratitude for the heroism with which Belgium had repelled the German menace and willingly accepted, in the name of international solidarity, the sacrifices attendant upon four years of pitiless war and occupation. It was the

logical solution to the problems arising from the special position that Belgium occupied in the war. Belgium was neutral because of the policies imposed by the great powers at the time she was set up as an independent state. And Belgium was dragged into the last war only as a result of the felony of Germany. She had, then, every right, from the standpoint of international law, to consider herself above the conflict. The guaranteeing powers, England and France, who, in strict adherence to their word, became our allies, recognized the validity of Belgium's special position and consequently gave her a prior claim to financial reparations.

Belgium was attacked on May 10th, 1940, in injustice and bad faith—no less shameful than the injustice and bad faith which stigmatized the German invasion of 1914. And, therefore, her claims to equitable indemnities are no less considerable than after 1918. How and to what extent can these claims be satisfied? We shall have to wait until the end of the war before being very precise on this issue. But it is relevant to point out here and now, that the Nazi occupation has been, from the economic point of view, even more severe than the regime imposed by the armies of the Kaiser. The Nazis have carried out more systematic pillage—on more hypocritical grounds, to be sure—a more complete financial destruction, and have exacted a harsher toll than Belgium had to endure from 1914 to 1918. Belgium is not, unfortunately, the only country to suffer from the scientifically barbarous methods of the Nazis. The continent of Europe alone will have so many claims for damages that it is almost inconceivable that whatever segments remain of Germany after her defeat will be able to sat-

isfy them. Nevertheless, it is only just to keep to the forefront in the allocation of indemnities the special nature of the damages incurred by the occupied countries. The very nature of these inflictions, and the particularly distressing situations arising from them, give these countries the right to demand special attention when the problem of reparations comes up.

But above all other considerations come those mentioned at the beginning of this article. Nothing stated there is not in conformity, down to the slightest detail, with the statements made by the two great chiefs of the allied democracies, President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill, nothing which, from the standpoint of Belgium, could be construed as the slightest lack of unity with her allies. Through her legal representatives, Belgium has subscribed to the Atlantic Charter and to the pledge to continue the struggle until we are all victorious. She did so because her vital interests are in complete harmony with the principles held in common by the United Nations.

By the restoration of her independence, Belgium will recover at the same time all the moral liberties and safeguards which are the boasts of a real democracy and which cannot fail to compel any people unworthy of them to resist unflinchingly the ruthless ambitions of totalitarian dictators. The Belgian Constitution, in one article (Article 25) which logically should have been its preamble, affirms solemnly that all political power is invested in the people. The royal power itself, although the Belgians have always accorded it great honor and respect, derives its authority only from the will of the people, expressed by the constitution and the acts of

Parliament. Even though, in Belgium as in all European countries, the right to vote was limited at first to a minority of citizens considered best qualified to participate in the management of the country, either because of their education or their social position, freedom of suffrage was always one of the inalienable prerogatives of the Belgian electoral body. Moreover, the constitution itself has always protected the representatives of the people from any interference by the executive and even the judiciary authorities, should they seek to limit their freedom of speech or hinder their freedom of action in Parliament. The most humble, as well as the most privileged, citizen has always enjoyed complete legal security of his person and his house. Every Belgian has always had the right to exercise, without any hindrance whatsoever, freedom of conscience, of education, of assembly, and of speech. The only reproach that could be brought against the Belgian voter or the Belgian legislator is that both sometimes erred through too great confidence in liberty, and failed to arm the government or loyal citizens against the abuses of disloyal men who called on their legal rights only in order that they might violate, with impunity, both the spirit and the letter of those rights.

Belgium is not prepared to give up a system of popular sovereignty and legal safeguards which have been the source of her well-being for more than a century and which, in her hour of trial, have given her people, without distinction of race, party, or class, a moral strength which even the enemy himself has had to acknowledge.

It was a horrible fate for Belgium to be the victim of

the same rape and oppression twice in less than twenty-five years. Just as she did before, she will persevere in the fight, beside her allies, until the criminal aggressors are finally destroyed. But she wants, in the future, to be assured of protection from a recurrence of the same tragedy. Belgium demands that Germany, after defeat, be rendered forever incapable of committing any military aggression, and that lasting peace be assured by an international organization which will be ready and strong enough to crush any unjustified resort to force. The remedy does not consist, as some believe, in the suppression of the small nations. It would be a crime against justice and civilization to deny a free existence to nations which, through their courage as well as through their ennobling qualities, have added much to the glory of human history, simply because they could not, by force of arms, defend themselves unaided against aggression by great powers. The peace, as well as the honor of the nations, will be safe only if there exists an international organization strong enough to guarantee, to small and large, an equal security under the law. That was the proposition set forth by President Wilson in Article 14 of his famous message of January, 1918. The same principle was brought forward previously by Pope Benedict XV in his letter of August 1, 1917 to the heads of the belligerent states. It is also the conception held by their respective successors and one of the essential aims of the Atlantic Charter. The security of small nations is not only a right for themselves; it is besides, as President Wilson expressed it in irrefutable terms, a necessity for the safeguard of international law and of peaceful relations among large nations. "Unless this

principle be made its foundation no part of the structure of international justice can stand."¹

It has often been alleged against the small European nations—and Belgium has often met with the same reproach—that their policy of isolation and neutrality paved the way for German aggression and thus contributed to their own misfortunes. For those who enjoy the pleasures of hindsight, no period in history has ever been more fertile than the truce between the two world wars. It is easy to shower blame; but, at any rate, the small countries can comfort themselves with the thought that, even though they are not completely above reproach, they were not responsible for the failure of disarmament, nor of collective security, nor for the final bankruptcy of the League of Nations itself. Whatever the responsibility, Belgium had too many blood-stained memories not to recognize the dangers of her geographical position. Although she never completely recovered from the wounds of the first World War, Belgium did not hesitate to align herself with all policies which, if diligently followed, might have saved Europe and the world from the present disaster. She had the honor to preside at the first assembly of the League of Nations; she subscribed to the Pact of Locarno; she was the first to ratify sanctions against Italy at the time of the invasion of Ethiopia; she was always ready to take part in any measure of collective security that was supported by both France and England, the principle guarantors of her safety. If she decided, in 1936, to adopt an independent policy, like that followed by Holland, it was not a reversal of her traditional po-

¹ Cf. Point 14 of President Woodrow Wilson's address, Jan. 8, 1918.

sition. It was simply the result of the uncertain policies of our former allies and of the lack of accord which was too often evident in their conduct.

Belgium, after this war, will be happy to make her contribution again to interallied policies and to an international organization which will effectively guarantee the maintenance of law and peace. "I am certain," Monsieur Hubert Pierlot, Prime Minister of Belgium, declared on June 28th, 1941¹ when the allied governments made a joint declaration on the subject of the war and the peace, "I am certain that Belgium will contribute to the organization of any system of common security undertaken under the initiative of Great Britain. Belgium will undertake her share of necessary sacrifices as she did from the beginning of the last war, provided such guarantees are effective. Her defensive efforts will only be limited by her available strength provided powers exposed like herself to the same risks will also observe that vigilance whose necessity has been shown by experience."

Among people interested in political science there is a great deal of talk of limitation of sovereignty. I do not like to use a formula which might too easily smell of submission of the small to the will of the great. Of course the extent of a country's resources and its consequent responsibilities can legitimately carry weight in some cases. But it would be more just an accurate to speak of duties of solidarity, before which individual freedom, in the field of international politics as well as in the social domain, must give way. From that point of view, none of the allied states would stand to lose its

¹ See *News from Belgium*, No. 13, January 28th, 1941.

moral personality or its autonomy, or its right to an equality of treatment which would be as binding upon the great powers as upon the weaker nations.

An international organization conceived in that sense has nothing in common with the New Order that the Nazis presume to foist upon Europe. The Nazi New Order is an order of submission, subordination, slavery. Nazi peace is the peace of the prison; and, for those who cannot or will not submit to it, the peace of the grave.

An international organization restricted to Europe—call it Union or Federation—seems to us potentially dangerous, even after the defeat of Germany, because it would inevitably foster in Germany the same ambitions and subject the world to the same dangers as those against which the present war is being waged.

The order that we claim is a structure based on law, the sanctuary of human worth, and defended, in accordance with a code of international honesty, by an association of free peoples who are determined to assure the prosperity of all and the safety of each one by their common effort and, if need be, by common sacrifice.

Such an association is only possible if there exists mutual respect and confidence. It must find its support in common traditions and in a mutual conception of life and human society. For us Belgians no alliance seems more natural than an alliance with England, whose spirit corresponds to our own and whose interests are a guarantee of our independence. But England, no more than ourselves, can live in isolation, and we hope that the union of free nations, which we long to see established, will find its base in a strong and lasting union of the English-speaking nations: the United

States of America and the members of the British Empire.

Without a post-war alliance, strong and effective enough to frustrate the aims of aggressive powers, there can be no satisfactory and lasting economic reconstruction. Without the conviction of a secure peace, there can be no international confidence; without confidence there can be no spirit of free enterprise. But the peace must be based on a common regard for justice and liberty; otherwise, any economic groups might themselves become the sources of new policies of domination.

It is impossible, under the present circumstances, to form a clear idea of what the economic situation will be at the end of the war or how it should be dealt with. But it is not assuming too much to state that the economic reconstruction of the world, any more than the peace itself, cannot be assured, unless the United States and the British Empire form the core around which the other free nations can group themselves.

The close industrial collaboration and the extraordinary financial arrangements brought into being by the war, notably under the form of Lend-lease, will undoubtedly pave the way for the agreements the United Nations will have to undertake, if they are to make the transition to a real economy of peace. That is why the Belgium Government has willingly and without reserve subscribed to the declarations and agreements which concern the present or future economic co-operation among the United Nations.

However, there should be no illusions either about the numerous difficulties which will be presented by the problem of the economic liquidation of the war, or

about the many occasions on which the interests of the present allied countries will be in opposition. These difficulties will arise not only between countries based on contradictory economic principles, like Russia and America, but also between countries like America and England and, among all countries whose political organization is directly dependent on the free will of the electorate, and hence subject to being contradicted and turned aside from its original intentions by powerful combinations of classes or of interests. The experience of the last war has given a salutary warning on this point.

It is not irrelevant to point out here the unfavorable position of the occupied countries, like Belgium. We have already called attention to the pillage and the financial ruin wrought on Belgium by the conqueror. But it is not alone of her savings and her industrial resources that she has been robbed. On the day of her liberation she will find herself in competition with a world whose productive power will have been multiplied and diversified. She will be faced with an international economic organization which will be in firm possession of all the markets of the New World and the British Empire, the only ones which will have kept a real power of acquisition, and the only ones which, to some extent, will be open to free competition. A similar situation during the first World War gave rise to a conference among the Allies, held at Paris in 1917, during which compensatory markets were promised to the countries then occupied by the enemy. Unfortunately, it was an empty gesture. But through harsh experience Belgium—a small but highly industrialized country—

realized how dangerous it is to be severed from commercial outlets during a period, as in time of war, when the character of the economic world rapidly changes. We hope that the allied powers, after the many sufferings they will have borne in common during this new war, will stick together more closely than they did after the peace of 1918. We hope also that this spirit of unity will be generous enough to permit those among the United Nations which have had to undergo the odious burden of enemy occupation to gain compensation for the terrible economic handicaps imposed upon them.

It will be readily understood, under these circumstances, how much importance Belgium attaches to the maintenance of her colonial empire: the Belgium Congo. The total occupation of Belgian territory has not prevented the Belgian Government from placing the entire resources of her colony at the disposition of the allied powers for the prosecution of the war. The colonial administrative and commercial bodies have outdone themselves to make this contribution an important one; and the Belgian Colonial Army played a brilliant part in the Abyssinian campaign. The magazine, *Foreign Commerce*, published by the American Department of Commerce, devoted an article, signed by Harry W. Newman, to the economic importance of the Belgian Congo in the defense of the United Nations, pointing up with impressive statistics the extent of the colony's contribution to the war. We will not cite these figures, but we call attention to them because they plead the cause of the Belgian Congo in a fashion that must not go unrecognized after the war. As the war becomes intensified in Africa or adjacent territory, the role of the

Belgian Congo will become greater. Nothing must be skimped or left undone, which may serve the war effort of the United Nations. But in return Belgium expects that she may count on their help to repel any attempt which might challenge her colonial sovereignty.

Belgium is all the more justified in demanding complete respect for her rights, because she has never dreamed of exploiting her African territory selfishly nor imposing on the colony any regime incompatible with the principles of equality and economic liberty proclaimed by the Atlantic Charter. The Congo has been, since 1885, by the Act of Berlin, administered under a policy which guarantees to all nations equal access to its resources and economic potentialities. Consequently, the Congo has for a long time been in a position which corresponds entirely to the prospectus for the future peace. And Belgium can congratulate herself that she has always scrupulously honored the obligations assumed when she took over the Congo from the hands of her august sovereign, Leopold II, founder of the Independent State of the Congo. The leading role that she has since played in the economic development of her colony, from which the war effort of the United Nations is now reaping the benefit, she won through the work of her pioneers and through the contribution of her savings by not heeding many risks. Belgium has enriched the savage land of Central Africa, through the admirable work of her missionaries, the devotion of her colonial officers, the often heroic courage of her military forces. The civilizing work of Belgium in the Congo can stand any amount of comparison or examination. But if her civilizing influence constitutes a point

of pride for the past, it has also become, through the sacrifices it has cost, a sacred heritage for which Belgium will demand respect when the morrow dawns.

Independence, security, the right to work, respect for her colonial patrimony—that is Belgium's entire peace program. To bring it about she will go to the limits of her endurance and of human courage during the war. She will loyally assume her share of all the duties that peaceful people accept in common after the war, to assure their common rehabilitation. In so far as within her lies, Belgium will be ready to assist in any policing necessary for the maintenance of peace. She hopes that the end of this war will see the conscience of all peoples assuaged by a signal act of justice against the criminals who have subjected the world to its new misery; and that, thereby, a warning will be given to anyone who might, in the future, be tempted to emulate their diabolic work.

But this last consideration goes beyond the responsibilities of a little country like Belgium and lies outside the peace aims peculiar to her. Her only real ambition is to demonstrate to the world that two pitiless wars have exhausted neither her courage nor her spirit. The world of tomorrow would be unworthy of the sorrows which have engendered it, if small, but honorable, nations were forbidden to achieve such an ambition.

.

CHINA

China Emergent *

By MADAME CHIANG KAI-SHEK (*Mayling Soong Chiang*),
the co-worker of her husband, the Generalissimo.

It may not seem to be the best of good sense to prepare plans for architectural improvements while the house is still afire and one is having hard work to extinguish the flames. Yet the United Nations realize that after the war is won new problems will automatically arise which will demand for their solution as much thought, devotion, and practical application of idealism as winning the war itself. While it is true that in the midst of life there is death, it is equally true that in the midst of death there is life.

We in China, though we have been harried for years by death and destruction, have been giving careful thought toward the perfection of a political and social system that will ensure in the future the greatest good for the greatest number. All the existing systems of government in the world—and this applies to the non-aggressive as well as to the aggressive nations—are being weighed in the remorseless balance of war. Some we are sure will not survive the test, but all have shown weaknesses that call for drastic alterations. "It is only

* This article first appeared in the May, 1942 issue of *The Atlantic Monthly* and is reprinted with their permission.

the very wisest and the very stupidest who never change," observed one of our sages.

We have chosen the path that we shall tread in the future. We are determined that there shall be no more exploitation of China. I have no wish to harp on old grievances, but realism demands that I should mention the ruthless and shameless exploitation of our country by the West in the past and the hard-dying illusion that the best way to win our hearts was to kick us in the ribs. Such asinine stupidities must never be repeated, as much for your own sake as for ours. America and Britain have already shown their consciousness of error by voluntarily offering to abrogate the iniquitous system of extraterritoriality that denied China her inherent right to equality with other nations.

While as a nation we are resolved that we will not tolerate foreign exploitation, we are equally determined that within our country there be no exploitation of any section of society by any other section or even by the state itself. The possession of wealth does not confer upon the wealthy the right to take unfair advantage of the less fortunate. But neither, as a nation, does China believe in communism or wish to obtain it in our land. We have no use for most isms which pose as panaceas for all the ills of the human race. In fact all forms of authoritarianism adopted by some European countries, Japan, and certain Latin-American republics (which in late years have flirted a little, discreetly perhaps, with dictatorship) leave the Chinese people cold. We are disposed to be politely skeptical of sweeping claims such as are made by Henry George's

single-taxers, who believe that all that is wrong with the world could be righted by a tax on land values.

In post-war China, although we shall not countenance exploitation, international or national, we shall grant private capital its rightful place, for it implements, individual initiative, and we Chinese, being realists, fully recognize basic facts. Our age-old civilization has been developed through harmonizing conditions as they existed and as they ideally should be. But no individual will be permitted to wax rich at the expense of others. The rights of the people will be protected by progressive taxation. I maintain that when incomes exceed legitimate needs and a reasonable margin to ensure freedom from want the excess should belong to humanity. On the other hand, private capital must be given every encouragement to develop the resources and industry of the country—but only in co-operation with labor. All public utilities should be state-owned.

Any governmental policy in China ought to take cognizance of the all-important fact that we are an agricultural nation. Over 90 per cent of our people are dependant directly or indirectly upon the land—the overwhelming proportion directly. It follows that the nation cannot flourish unless the farmers are prosperous. At present they are enjoying a degree of prosperity undreamed of since the Golden Age. As a by-product of war, prices for all that comes from the land have increased so much that the standard of living of the rural population has reached a height that did not seem possible. Children are attending school who formerly would never have had a chance of education; homes that have been perforce mere inadequate protection

from the elements are being made hygienic and comfortable. This is as it should be.

We want these gains held and consolidated. This vision of a better life that has been given to the backbone of our nation must not be dimmed by the policy bequeathed us by the conservative past. There has been one fly in the ointment—there always is: while those who live on and by the land have prospered, government employees and men and women classed as intellectuals have been having a hard time to make ends meet. But they represent a very small percentage of our people; when victory is won, a permanent solution of their difficulties will be arrived at. It is significant, however, that the masses of our people are now following the path of progress and happiness, from which I hope they will never swerve, certainly not as a consequence of any act of omission or commission by our government.

We are striving to institute a flexible system of political and economic development that will serve the future as well as the present. This attempt started directly China became a republic, thirty-one years ago, and has continued even throughout the war years. In order to give our people fuller and better opportunities for a well-rounded and happier life, a new kind of Chinese socialism, based on democratic principles, is evolving. It is no mere pale reflection of Western socialism. China colors all seas that wash her shores. We do not necessarily reject everything the West has to offer; to views of modern socialists we lend a willing ear, more especially as most of their ideas find their counterpart in the third of the three principles envisaged by our

late leader, Dr. Sun Yat-sen, upon which our whole ideology is based. These three principles are: first, Nationalism; second, the People's Rights; third, the People's Livelihood. Nationalism means that there should be equality among all peoples and races, and that all peoples and races should respect each other and live in peace and harmony. The People's Rights means that the people should have these four rights: election, recall, initiative, and referendum. The People's Livelihood means that people are entitled to proper clothing, food, housing, and communications.

II

Westerners may be surprised to learn that China is the Columbus of democracy. Twenty-four centuries before the Christian era, Emperors Yau, Shun, and Yü succeeded each other by their subjects' wish instead of by hereditary right. Over a thousand years before Confucius an articulate political platform proclaimed, "The people's views are heaven's voice," anticipating by centuries the Western adage: "Vox populi vox Dei." From earliest times a system of local government prevailed in our country, based upon subdivisions of the *hsien*, or county, which, as I shall explain later, is the foundation upon which we now are framing—even in wartime—our constitutional government. Mencius, in the fourth century before Christ, enunciated the theory that the people rank first, the state second, the ruler last. Jean Jacques Rousseau's *Social Contract*, published in 1762, rings like an echo of *The Essays* published by Huang Lichow in 1663. Huang, in discussing political

theories, severely criticized the monarchial form of government. In a chapter on "The Origin of Rulers" he dwelt at length on differences among ancient rulers and the autocrats who followed them; the former regarded their country as the hub of the universe while the latter held themselves to be of primary importance. Logically Huang urged the overthrow of such rulers in order to establish the people's government. This subject might be pursued further, but enough has been said to substantiate the observation that China, long before the West, embraced democratic ideals.

I have already referred to Chinese socialism, for our political compass shows our ship of state ploughing in that direction. Nevertheless, some people are alarmed at the very word "socialism," much as a timid horse shies away from its own shadow. Actually, though not called by that name, socialism has influenced national thought in China for decades, even amid the confusion caused by civil unrest and the present war. But it does not have any affiliation with communism. The Chinese do not accept the much-mooted theory of enriching the poor by dispossessing present owners of their wealth, nor do they believe such a step would give any prospect of an enduring alleviation of poverty and human misery. We prefer leveling up to leveling down. Before the present war started, the political tutelage which Dr. Sun Yat-sen decreed should precede full constitutional government had been put into practice for the purpose of laying sound and lasting democratic foundations for the people to build upon. Some progress had already been made when Japan forced us to take up arms to fight for freedom on July 7, 1937.

In the midst of war in 1938 the People's Political Council was established as the precursor of a National Parliament. This body of 240 members includes not only regional representatives, some of whom are women, elected by provincial and municipal popular assemblies, but also scholars and experts appointed by the National Government. It has the power of revision and recommendation and has become an important element of our national life. One of its outstanding achievements was the adoption of a proposal to constitute the county (*hsien*) as a unit of self-government. As I write, greater scope of action and further popular representation have been given to the Council.

This new *hsien* system aims to enable people to manage the affairs of their home districts by electing their own representatives to local governing organizations. When this program for local self-government is carried out, they will be free to elect their chief magistrate. Furthermore, these assemblies, composed entirely of elected representatives, will choose delegates to a national convention for the purpose of adopting and promulgating a permanent national constitution and for the election of the president of China.

From the base to the apex the political structure will be erected by the people themselves. Thus the rules and regulations of the new *hsien* system are much more than a mere step toward local self-government. They are a political move forward in the direction of national democracy.

Some of our time-honored institutions such as our trade guilds will usefully complement this new pattern of national political growth. For centuries they have

been a valuable feature of our social and commercial life. The provincial guilds in our large cities relieve fellow provincials in distress, settle disputes among members, thus preventing costly litigation, and help in numerous other ways. We propose to give these organizations more executive power and to obtain for the government the benefit of their experience.

Regarding civil administration, I have often expressed strong views about our civil service. I hold no brief for a system of political patronage. In our country, after the war, civil service appointments must be made on merit alone. Fitness to hold a position should in the future be the criterion for government service, not friendship or the favor of those in high and influential places. Nepotism must be completely jettisoned. This is a reform that I, for one, have always advocated, and it has been started on its way.

Their age-long experience has taught the Chinese people that all mundane things change, and even social and political systems are subject to transmutation. Chinese thinkers today are therefore content if they can so fashion the framework that the political fabric of the future can be woven and expanded in the best interests of the nation.

Chinese socialism, if you like to call it that, seeks above all else to preserve the birthrights of the individual. No state can be great and prosperous unless the people are contented. They can only be content if their dignity and rights as human beings are kept inviolate. To cherish the worth of the human personality is what we seek, and we are therefore giving the individual

ever-increasing power to decide his own and the nation's future.

III

One of our national characteristics is not to do things without careful deliberation. Those who are privileged to direct the aspirations of a quarter of the world's population have a wonderful opportunity but a fearful responsibility. This responsibility has grown weightier, now that China has become the leader of Asia. If their program for social and political development is carelessly planned, they will imperil the happiness of hundreds of millions of their fellow countrymen and jeopardize the very core of world society. No instrument devised by human brains can be absolutely perfect. We, however, are recruiting the wisest intelligence available amongst our people in order to ensure that the political and economic machinery which will swing into full operation in China after the war will be as nearly perfect as possible and susceptible of readjustment without causing civil unrest. To my mind democracy means representative government, and by "representative" I mean representative of the steadfast and settled will of the people as opposed to the irresponsible and spell-binding slogans of political hawkers. Furthermore, in a true democracy the minority parties should not be left out of consideration. I am opposed to any system which permanently gives absolute power to a single party. That is the negation of real democracy, to which freedom of thought and progress are essential. A one-party system denies both. Freedom of thought and action should be given to minorities as long as the

activities of such groups are not incompatible with the interests and security of the state.

There is no necessity, moreover, for the systems of democracy in our respective countries to be slavish replicas of each other. They must adhere to the fundamental principle, of course, but each democracy should have an order that fits truly its own peculiar requirements. Therefore, our Chinese democracy will not be a colorless imitation of your American democracy, although it will undoubtedly be influenced by the Jeffersonian views of equality of opportunity and the rights of the individual. It will be redolent of our soil and expressive of the native genius of our people. It must meet China's own needs and be in harmony with our present environment, which is inevitably linked to the best traditions of our past.

Considering what China has already accomplished in the face of heartbreaking obstacles, we confront the future with calmness and confidence. The difficulties before us are stupendous; but with the help, from our sister democracies, of technique and capital, which we have proved we deserve, we have no doubt we can solve our problems. The fortune of war has brought China for the first time abreast of the great powers. We have won our place in the front rank by our prolonged and unyielding resistance to violence. We shall keep it by playing a major part in building a better world.

In the old world that is crumbling to pieces as I write, nations strove with each other to win supremacy in the means of destruction. The defunct League of Nations, whatever its shortcomings, had in its conception of world peace an area of thought which we should do well

to cultivate. While lip-service to international equality and justice was not found wanting, signatories of the League Covenant did not have the courage actively to implement the principles enunciated so piously by their representatives round the conference table. China, Abyssinia, Spain, Poland, and other militarily weak nations became the victims of aggression, and the democracies, which should have seen their own fate from the writing on the wall, did little more than make futile protests. It is my hope, therefore, that when victory is ours we shall have learned the lesson that "the substance of wisdom is made out of the substance of folly," and profit thereby. Cannot we, in the new day whose dawn is nearing, strive together to gain supremacy in the peaceful arts of government and administration that will secure lasting happiness for the people of all races and thus create a world vitalized by new hopes and worshipping a more Christlike ideal?

.

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

The Czechoslovak Republic and the Democratic Way of Life in Central Europe

By JAN MASARYK, *Vice-Premier and Foreign Minister.*

On March 15, 1939 the German troops entered Prague. From that day my countrymen were at war. So our war with Germany has lasted for more than three and a half years already. It is true that our war is fought chiefly on the home front, and I think that we have done our best to frustrate German aims. Our skilled workmen make the most unsatisfactory slaves. German difficulties multiply in the Protectorate which Germany planned to make the chief arsenal for her war against Russia. My countrymen did all they could to weaken the German war effort in Bohemia and Moravia last winter, and the shocking treatment which they received under Heydrich and his successor, Daluge, has merely strengthened their resolve never to relax until the last German soldier, and the last Nazi official have been kicked out of Czechoslovakia.

That is the war on the home front. There is the war elsewhere. In all parts of the world—in North America, the Soviet Union and Great Britain—men of Czechoslovak descent have responded to the call of arms, and I have no doubt that when the forces of the United Na-

tions fight their way through to the heart of a stricken Europe the Czechoslovak troops will lack nothing in courage and initiative. They have already proved their worth in the campaigns in Poland and in France.

I recapitulate these few facts because the future should belong to those who have fought against the aggressor. And the man who has done, and will do, the real fighting is unquestionably the common man—the common man in England, in America, Russia, Norway, Belgium, Holland, Czechoslovakia, Poland; the common man in France. He has been dragged from the homestead against his will. Behind all the panaceas and schemes for peace there can be but one purpose—to ensure that the common man shall not be dragged from his homestead again. A man cannot live by fighting alone. He wants to sow and to reap. Those are his really deep and elementary needs.

Recognition of this fact was, I believe, the rock on which my father and his contemporaries hoped to build the Czechoslovak Republic. They were democrats. They believed in freedom of worship, freedom of belief, freedom of speech and freedom of access because on these freedoms rested human dignity, human understanding and human security. I do not wish to exaggerate my father's contributions to the political thought and achievement of the twentieth century. His mind was active and alert almost to the day of his death. He never hesitated to change his opinions or to admit that he had been wrong. Simple observations harden into dogmas. The wise words of a living man can become very dangerous when he is dead. None knew better than my father that a reactionary is often a man who stands in

the shoes of a dead progressive. He faced the problems of his own age. He would hate to have any of his books—no matter what months of labor and thought they represented—regarded as infallible political scripture.

And yet essentially, I am convinced, my father's political philosophy still holds good. When Karel Čapek entered the little room in which my father lay dead, he found an open book by the bedside. It was Heider's "One Man Against Europe." The ideas my father upheld are bound to triumph over Hitler's. There are deep strains of cruelty, fear, lust and wantonness in man. Hitler succeeded by appealing to what was base, not what was good. Plato believed that when man saw the good, the beautiful and the true he embraced them, and I was delighted with a recent tribute which the Archbishop of Canterbury paid to my father. Thomas Masaryk, he said, came very near to embodying the Platonic ideal of "the philosopher-King." Masaryk against Hitler is a twentieth-century version of the age-long struggle waged by Plato and Socrates, by Roger Bacon, Galileo and Newton. It is the war of Light against Darkness.

Plato made his appeal to reason. Hitler appeals to ignorance. In a Continent like Europe where races have intermingled for centuries, it is almost madness to suppose that anyone is entirely devoid of Jewish or Germanic or Slav or Latin ancestry; but Hitler got a hearing for his absurd doctrines of racial superiority. He called upon the strong to make war on the weak. He developed the hierarchic system and called it the New Order. The best positions were reserved for the particularly mixed race of Germans, and even among

them promotion went to the yes-men. The State was all; the individual was nothing. It is a very ancient heresy, and the pity of it is that men should accept it as the truth. They welcomed stupidity. The newspapers, designed for disseminating facts, became the instruments of cheap propaganda. The radio, which might have enabled nation to speak unto nation, expresses hatred and abuse. The preachers are silenced. There is no room for the men of wisdom and understanding. The great Greco-Roman civilization counts for nothing.

Yet we ask that the whole orientation of German and Axis policy shall be reversed. We declare that the State exists for man, not man for the State. Czechoslovakia is not, and can never become, a Great Power. She exists because a small country has just as much right to exist as a large one. Primarily, of course; Hitler made war upon Czechoslovakia because he believed with Bismarck that the master of Bohemia is the master of Europe. But he also made war upon Czechoslovakia because she was a free country; and freedom Hitler detests. The love of freedom, is in fact, the one stubborn obstacle to the New Order. It condemns the New Order and will make no compromises with it. When Hitler uttered his violent denunciations against Dr. Beneš on the eve of the Munich decree, did we not hear the echoes of other savage attacks upon civilization? The powers of darkness triumph over and over again. The only consolation is that their triumphs do not endure. The equilibrium of civilization is restored.

It was by no means exclusively the fault of the Czechoslovak people that their Republic went down within six months of the Munich decree. Their leaders

had done all they could to persuade the statesmen of Europe that salvation rested upon an active system of collective security. They were not successful. But what the Czechslovak people gained in the past they are determined to recapture. The Czechoslovak Republic will be restored. Its institutions will be Parliamentary, representative and free. We hope and believe that the Republic, when restored, will be even more democratic than it had been in the past. For we are conscious of many shortcomings. We had contended ourselves with political democracy and failed to realize that the battle for economic democracy had still to be waged and won. By making Czechoslovakia safe for democracy we shall go a long way towards making Europe safe for democracy.

Now I know that a prejudice exists against the small State. The observer in the United States was impatient with what he called the parochial politics of Central and Eastern Europe. Men quarrelled over frontier boundaries and tariff walls and overlooked the deadly peril of the aggressor Powers. Modern warfare is such a complex affair that a small State cannot be engaged in it without the wholehearted assistance of well-armed and well-organized Allies. The small State must work harmoniously with its neighbors or perish. Good neighbors are in the long run more important than friendly but distant Powers, for diplomacy cannot by itself remove the barriers and disabilities of geography. When I think of my country in peace-time I think of her right relations with Poland, Austria, Yugoslavia, Hungary and, indeed, Germany. Then I think of the Great Powers anxious to promote those right relations

and not to aggravate or poison them. The right equilibrium of peace rests upon many factors, some of them rather impermanent. We pay a heavy price for living in an old Continent where history dogs the reformer or the diplomat at almost every step. We need desperately to find the right leadership; but are we not far more likely to find it in a democracy where character, judgment and integrity receive their due recognition than dictatorship where places go to the yes-men?

We Czechoslovaks are doing what we can to achieve this equilibrium. For nearly two years the Czechoslovak and Polish statesmen in London have been discussing a scheme of confederation between our two countries. This scheme we shall submit on our return home to the peoples of our two countries for their endorsement and ratification. We believe that such a confederation would give strength to Central Europe where hitherto there was weakness and uncertainty. But both the Polish and the Czechoslovak statesmen insist that democratic institutions must be firmly rooted in Poland as well as in Czechoslovakia.

Now as before the war we realize the importance of the idea of co-operation in Central Europe. It should not stop with a confederation of Poland and Czechoslovakia. We have other neighbors with whom we desire to live in greater political and economic harmony. For long Austria battled bravely against most insuperable difficulties. For long her Republic was representative and democratic. She inaugurated some social reforms of which she could be justly proud. But in the end authoritarianism won over the forces of democracy. That was a bad day for democracy and a bad day for

Europe. Austria, I believe, can be won back to democracy. Austrians hate the Nazis who betrayed their country. But what of Hungary with her deep attachment to feudal and anti-democratic ways of life? Between feudal Hungary and her democratic neighbors there can hardly be a final understanding. Is it not abundantly clear that only a profound change of outlook in Hungary can pave the way to her return among the nations now fighting against her on the other side of the barrier? Yet she alone must achieve the permanent change of that policy which for the second time has stranded her in the camp of pan-Germanism. The defeat at the hands of the United Nations will, undoubtedly, help this development.

I do not wish to put forward any panacea of perpetual peace. I am the Foreign Minister of a small Republic. But I ask that we shall have the conditions which will make it possible for us to lead the democratic way of life. Actually that is a tremendous demand. Democracy is not axiomatic. Many who proclaim it publicly do not believe in it in their heart of hearts. Fundamentally they distrust the human passions. They are authoritarian without realizing it. Almost subconsciously they seek the paths of appeasement and take the line of least resistance; so that freedom is constantly imperilled. I hope that the statesmen of the United Nations will continue to fight ruthlessly for democracy and freedom at the peace conference. Otherwise we shall lose the peace for the second time. We should hardly deserve to regain it.

THE FIGHTING FRENCH

Statements by Fighting French Leaders

Q. When the National Committee was first organized, the General himself insisted that the Committee be but the provisional trustee of authority until such time as it could be handed to the elected representatives of the nation. Would the General convene Parliament or take any measures concerning the various political parties?

A. I believe that the French people will be unanimous in their desire to have a new assembly convened which will express their will. I do hope that means will be found to link constitutionally the new French National Assembly to what existed before. It may become necessary to contemplate certain political procedures and the intervention of the heads of political parties and the presidents of the former Houses of Parliament, who would convene to form a Transitional Assembly. As to how the French people will be represented after the war, their general feeling is that they will not be represented by the former Parliament, because that Parliament abdicated during the celebrated session in the course of which it empowered Marshal Pétain to draft a new constitution.

Q. Are you yourself of the opinion that this new representation should be republican in character, based on universal suffrage?

A. I, for one, and the immense majority of the French people whose opinions I know, are quite resolved to recover the integrity of our national sovereignty and the republican form of government.

—*General de Gaulle at a press conference in London, May 27, 1942.*

In signing this joint declaration today, we mean, like all the representatives of the occupied countries, to declare solemnly that Germany alone is responsible for the outbreak of this war and also shares with her allies and accomplices the responsibility for all the atrocities that proceed from it. We demonstrate our firm intention to see to it that all the guilty parties and men who are responsible in any way should not be allowed to evade their just punishment as did those of the other war. But if it is legitimate and necessary to insure full punishment for the crimes committed, it is quite as legitimate and necessary to take essential measures so that the renewal of such crimes should be made impossible. We are certain that the solidarity which unites martyred Europe today will continue to manifest itself tomorrow when our task will consist in insuring that Germany will never again be in a position to harm the world.

—*General Charles de Gaulle, Free French Delegate to the Allied Conference on German War Crimes, held at London on January 13, 1942.*

All will be united in their resolve to bring out of this war freedom, greatness and safety for the homeland, and for each French worker, conditions making for a

free and secure life, the kind of life to which, as a man, he is entitled, and which, as a Frenchman, he so nobly deserves.

—General de Gaulle in a broadcast from London to France, April 30, 1942.

France hopes that with your material and moral support against the enemy and against traitors, the whole of our nation will be able to resume the fight, regain our national sovereignty, share in the victory and collaborate unreservedly with other democracies in the triumph of what President Roosevelt has so nobly called "the great human values."

—General de Gaulle in a broadcast to the American people from London, May 17, 1942.

From one end of the world to the other, over the battlefields as in the factories, among oppressed peoples as among free peoples, in the spirit of the man in the street as in that of leaders, rising above personal interests, prejudices, and rivalries, the wave of aspiration toward an international ideal mounts and rolls onward. For, if war, "which gives birth to everything" no longer allows nations to be unaware of their solidarity, it is clear that peace demands as much. To reconstruct a world becomes at the same time so disturbing, so complex and so detailed, that it will be necessary that the peoples who were united in the bloody effort remain so also in a charitable effort. By fighting from the first and until the final hour on the side of Liberty, France will have maintained her right and proclaimed her duty to share in the common task, which, without her active

help, would from the outset, be much imperilled. Yes, the organization of international solidarity on real and practical bases as well as the inspiration toward the eternal human ideal, is, for Fighting France, a clear and well-defined goal.

This war is a war of men, as Henry Wallace said recently, "The war of the common man." Men and women have been asked to sacrifice everything for victory; it is, therefore, they who should be the winners. For France in particular, where disaster and treason have disqualified most of the leaders and the privileged classes and where the great masses of the common people have, on the other hand, remained the most valiant and the most faithful, it would no longer be acceptable that the terrible trials leave in power the social and moral regime which was active against the nation. Fighting France intends that victory shall be for the benefit of everyone of her children. Strong in her restored national independence, security and grandeur, she desires that each Frenchman be assured and guaranteed liberty, security, and human dignity.

—General de Gaulle in a speech at the Albert Hall, London, on the second anniversary of the Free French movement, on June 18, 1942.

In spite of the fetters which hold the French in thrall, there are a thousand indications of what is going on in the inmost depths of their souls, which show their will and express their hopes. We proclaim them in the name of France and affirm her war aims.

We want France to recover everything that belongs to her. For us the end of the war means restoration

both of complete integrity to our home country, the Empire and the French heritage, and of the nation's absolute sovereignty over her own destiny.

Any attempt at usurpation whether from within or without, must be crushed. As we mean to make France again sole mistress in her own house, so shall we see to it that the French people are their own masters. Once freed from enemy oppression, all their liberties must be restored to them.

Once the enemy is driven from their land, all the men and women of France will then elect a National Assembly which will decide in full exercise of its sovereignty what course the future of the country shall take.

We want punishment for every threat aimed at French rights and French honor. Such threats must cease completely. This means, first, that enemy leaders who violate the laws of war to the detriment of either the person or the property of a Frenchman, shall be punished, together with traitors co-operating with them.

This also means that the totalitarian system which armed and incited our enemies, and that coalition of private interests which, in France, has acted in opposition to national interests, must once and for all be overthrown.

We want all Frenchmen to be able to live in security. In the sphere of external affairs we must have material guarantees which will make France's traditional invader incapable of further aggression and oppression. At home practical guarantees must be worked out to put an end to the tyranny of perpetual infringement of

rights and to insure liberty and the dignity of work to every citizen. To us, national and social security are imperative and inseparable aims.

We want to destroy forever the mechanical organization of society such as the enemy has achieved in contempt of religion, morals and charity, simply because they were strong enough to override others. In a rebirth of the economic activity of the nation and of the Empire, directed by a methodical technique, we want the age-old French ideal of liberty, equality and fraternity henceforth to be applied to our land in order that every individual may be free in belief and action, and that at the outset all may have equal opportunity in life, and that every man be respected by his fellow-men and helped, when in need.

We want this war which similarly affects the destiny of all peoples and has united the democracies in one and the same effort, to result in a world organization, establishing lasting solidarity and mutual help between nations in every sphere. And we intend that in this international organization France will take the eminent position to which her genius and her achievements entitle her.

France and the world are struggling and suffering for freedom, justice and the rights of the individual. These rights must be won in fact and in law so that both state and individual may benefit thereby.

Only such a victory for France and for humanity can compensate for the unparalleled trials our country is undergoing and only by such a victory will the road to greatness be open to France again.

Such a victory is worth every effort, every sacrifice.
We shall win.

—*General de Gaulle's message to the organizations of resistance in France, June 24, 1942.*

Today we are convinced that if the war and the peace are to be won, they will be won with France's assistance. Yes, France at first crushed while acting as the vanguard, will be an essential help in the decisive battles. Yes, France will help with all her genius in the reconstruction of a new world which will arise from the ruins.

—*General de Gaulle in a broadcast from London on July 8, 1942, during Free French Week.*

* * *

General de Gaulle, leader of the Free French, is glad of this opportunity to approve, together with the heads of the Allied Governments, the resolution proposed by His Britannic Majesty's Government. At a time when the French people are stirred by a tremendous determination to resist tyranny, the Free French are certain of being their faithful interpreters in adhering to the declaration formulated by the President of the United States of America and the Prime Minister of Great Britain in the names of the two great American and British peoples. This declaration of common principles by the Allies is most opportune. The whole world is thus in a position to estimate the irreconcilable opposition which exists between the New Order, which Hitler seeks to bring about by brute force, and the essential principles of a true human order such as the great Republic of the United States or the Allies conceive it and

are striving to make of it a reality. If any attempt of this sort has failed after a war which began nearly thirty years ago, is it not primarily because the intervening period was nothing more than a truce during which Germany, while inciting other countries to insensate desires, thought only of revenge? Hitler has merely revived in a more monstrous and brutal form, William II's dream of world domination.

France, which came into the present war without seeking any aggrandizement, whether territorial or otherwise, intended that, in conformity with the desire expressed in the name of Great Britain and of the United States of America, the right of peoples to self-determination, so cruelly violated for years past by the Axis powers, shall be restored in its various aspects: external independence and freedom to choose the form of government in harmony with the general interest, while also taking into account the duty incumbent upon civilized nations to protect the less advanced peoples and promote their development.

Invaded three times in less than a century by an adversary bent on death and destruction, France can see no safeguard for this independence and freedom, or for that of maritime communications, outside the framework of an effective organization of international security, an essential element of which is preliminary disarmament, the destruction of the military machine, and the limitation of potentialities in countries which have never ceased to threaten her and are still liable to do so. The French also consider as necessary to the establishment of a real peace the practical ratification

of the essential liberties of man and the concerted utilization, in view of the economic and social securities of peoples, of technical progress, creative of fresh wealth.

The time has not yet come when the guiding principles laid down in the joint declaration made by President Roosevelt and Mr. Winston Churchill can find expression in legal agreements and concrete application. That is why General de Gaulle shares Mr. Churchill's view that it would be vain to raise questions of interpretation now when their nature and scope would be difficult to determine. He believes that, once the French nation has been set free, its representatives will be in a position, like the other interested parties, to stress their point of view as regards the necessity to avoid any incentive of aggression, insure the righting of wrongs committed, and obtain effective guarantees of security, while taking the past into account. In order to achieve the great results envisaged here, all French people who are free again will be ready to collaborate with the other nations of the world. Indeed, when peace has come, constant respect for the law of solidarity will impose itself on all. In the future, it alone will enable us to avoid a repetition of those catastrophes which rend the unity of the human race.

—René Cassin, Commissioner of Justice and Public Instruction in the French National Committee, at a meeting of eleven Allied Nations in London on September 24, 1941, to consider the Roosevelt-Churchill Declaration of August 14, 1941.

France came into the war to fight against the aggressor of her ally Poland. She remains faithful to the alliance freely entered into with the United Kingdom, the British Empire and the peoples of the British Commonwealth of nations. She also remains closely united to the other nations whose emancipation she championed and whose development she promoted, as well as to the victims of German imperialism, whose terrible trials she now shares.

France repudiates the monstrous "new order," which it is attempted to impose upon her and in which she would play the part of her executioners' accomplice. She cannot think of peace without liberty, and the French and the people of the French Empire will continue the struggle until the complete victory of democracy over Germany and her associates has been won.

We mean to co-operate in building up a world which will be safe from all threat of aggression and which will offer economic and social security to all. That is the reason why, in the name of General de Gaulle, we adhere wholeheartedly to the spirit and to the letter of the draft of the resolution which is now before us. That is why we want to express our admiration and gratitude to the British people and to its Prime Minister, Mr. Winston Churchill, who is leading with such great energy the struggle of free peoples against tyranny.

At a time when there are those who are attempting to create a new order for the sole profit of a single state, a single race, and one man, against the desire, the honor and the interests of all other peoples, I should like to recall the words of Abraham Lincoln and to suggest that the new order which we wish to create should be

one of "government of the people, by the people, and for the people."

—*René Cassin, at a meeting of the Fourteen Allies in London on June 12, 1941.*

* * *

Tomorrow, in a liberated France, we want a new Republic, a renovated democracy, in which the working-class will have a large share, and in which modern technical methods will contribute to the eternal ideal of our country, as expressed in our national motto: "Liberty, Equality, Fraternity."

—*André Philip, Commissioner of Internal Affairs and Labor in the French National Committee, in a broadcast from London on July 30, 1942.*

* * *

In the wake of the German victory, some men who were not taken by surprise by that event, immediately built up what they called a National Revolution. This "National Revolution" has two characteristics: it is neither a revolution nor is it national. On the day of liberation the French people will sweep away this foreign creation with a feeling of disgust.

After the tragic days that the country has lived through, it will demand first and foremost of those to whom it will entrust the future of the country, proven sincerity in the matter of principles and lifelong convictions. Those terms worn bare by yesterday's regime and prostituted by the hypocritical camouflage of today's regime, will no longer suffice to express the need for righteousness and for utter sincerity.

Through Victory France will recover Liberty. We

pledge our unity to make the necessary political, economic and moral changes having their basis in the respect of popular sovereignty and the rights of man. And we mean to see that democracy is renovated from top to bottom and that it serves as a practical ideal and does not merely receive lip homage. And we shall demand that a strict discipline protect democracy from the trap of a *laissez faire* spirit, as well as from the spirit of violence, and we shall demand that democracy be armed against the lying press as well as the abusive pressure of money. The France of tomorrow, dedicated to obedience to law and a respect for principles and for reason, will make the world forget yesterday's defeat and today's shame.

The fight against the trusts has often been spoken of, but never undertaken and the sovereignty of labor has never been a reality. In accordance with the oldest traditions, we intend to give back to the working classes the right to organize, so that, through organizations of their choice, they can freely determine their fate and increasingly participate in the administration of the nation's economy. We want to eliminate the power of the trusts forever, either by putting certain activities under public control or by destroying the germs of monopoly and privilege. When liberation comes to France, she will know how to restore human dignity and correct old abuses, to assure social peace and fulfill her duty in all things.

As a result of the crisis through which France and Europe is now passing, Europe and the entire world will be transformed. With all our force we appeal for the collaboration of the liberated peoples of the uni-

verse so that we may, by this great trial, be made free from the oppression of special interests and the nightmare of war.

—Declaration of the Resistance Organizations in France, communicated to the press by the Office of the French National Commissioner of Information, London, September 28, 1942.

GREAT BRITAIN

Future Depends on the Restoration of the Four Freedoms *

By THE RIGHT HONORABLE ANTHONY EDEN, *Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs.*

Hitler has destroyed the bases of political and social co-operation throughout Europe and he is destroying her economic structure. The future of Europe will depend upon how moral and material reconstruction is brought about throughout the world.

While all our efforts are concentrated on winning the war, H. M. Government has naturally been giving careful thought to this all-important matter which has been equally in the mind of the President of the United States of America.

We have found in President Roosevelt's message to Congress in January 1941 the keynote of our own purposes. On that occasion the President said: "In the future days which we seek to make secure, we look forward to a world founded upon four essential human freedoms.

The *First* is freedom of speech and expression—everywhere in the world.

* Extracts from Mr. Eden's speech at the Mansion House in London, May 29, 1941.

The *Second* is freedom of every person to worship God in his own way—everywhere in the world.

The *Third* is freedom from want, which, translated into world terms, means economic understandings which will secure to every nation a healthy peacetime life for its inhabitants—everywhere in the world.

The *Fourth* is freedom from fear, which, translated into world terms, means a world-wide reduction of armaments to such a point and in such a thorough fashion that no nation will be in a position to commit an act of physical aggression against any neighbour—anywhere in the world.

That is no vision of a distant millennium. It is a definite basis for a kind of world attainable in our own time and generation. That kind of world is the very antithesis of the so-called 'New Order' of tyranny which the dictators seek to create with the crash of a bomb. To that new order we oppose the great conception—the 'moral order'."

Today I wish to put before you certain practical ways in which "freedom from want" may be applied to Europe.

We have declared that social security must be the first object of our domestic policy after the war. And social security will be our policy abroad not less than at home. It will be our wish to work with others to prevent the starvation of the post-armistice period, the currency disorders throughout Europe, and the wide fluctuations of employment, markets and prices which were the cause of so much misery in the twenty years between the two wars. We shall seek to achieve this in ways which will interfere as little as possible with the proper liberty of each country over its own economic fortunes.

The countries of the British Empire and their Allies, with the United States and South America, alone are in a position to carry out such a policy. For irrespective of the nature of the political settlement, continental Europe will end this war starved and bankrupt of all the foods and raw materials which she was accustomed to obtain from the rest of the world. She will have no means, unaided, of breaking the vicious circle. She can export few goods until she has, first of all, received the necessary raw materials. Wasteful wartime cultivations in many lands will leave agriculture almost as weak as industry. Thus Europe will face the vast problem of general demobilization with a general lack of the necessary means to put men to work.

Let no one suppose, however, that we for our part intend to return to the chaos of the old world. To do so would bankrupt us no less than others. When peace comes we shall make such relaxations of our war-time financial arrangements as will permit the revival of international trade on the widest possible basis. We shall hope to see the development of a system of international exchange in which the trading of goods and services will be the central feature. I echo Mr. Hull's admirable summing up in his recent declaration when he said:

"Institutions and arrangements of international finance must be so set up that they lend aid to the essential enterprises and continuous development of all countries and permit payment through processes of trade consonant with the welfare of all countries."

However, to meet the problems of the immediate post-war period action in other directions will also be required. The liberated countries, and maybe others

too, will require an initial pool of resources to carry them through the transitional period.

To organize the transition to peaceful activities will need the collaboration of the United States, of ourselves and of all free countries which have not themselves suffered the ravages of war. The Dominions and ourselves can make our contribution to this because the British Empire will actually possess overseas enormous stocks of food and materials, which we are accumulating so as to ease the problems of the overseas producers during the war, and of reconstructed Europe after the war. The Prime Minister has already made clear the importance he attaches to this.

What has Germany to offer on her side? Absolutely nothing. An official of the Reich Economics Ministry, in a moment of hard realism, published last Autumn, a statement that the present German rationing system must continue for at least one year after the restoration of peace, and perhaps for several. The huge latent demand for food, clothing and other articles of prime necessity which cannot be satisfied under war conditions will, he went on to say, again become active after the signature of a peace treaty, but the production of such commodities will not for a long while exceed wartime output.

All this is not only true but obvious. But if peace brings disappointment and such conditions continue beyond the disciplined period of war, social security can hardly survive.

No one can suppose that the economic reorganization of Europe after the Allied victory will be an easy task. But we shall not shirk our opportunity and our respon-

sibility to bear our share of the burdens. The peaceful brotherhood of nations, with due liberty to each to develop its own balanced economic life and its characteristic culture, will be the common object. But it is the transition to this end which presents the problem. It is the establishment of an international economic system, capable of translating the technical possibilities of production into actual plenty, and maintaining the whole population in a continuous fruitful activity, which is difficult. The world cannot expect to solve the economic riddle easily or completely. But the free nations of America, the Dominions and ourselves alone possess a command of the material means.

And, what is perhaps more important, these nations clearly have the will and the intention to evolve a post-war order which seeks no selfish national advantage; an order where each member of the family shall realize its own character and perfect its own gifts in liberty of conscience and person. We have learnt the lesson of the interregnum between the two wars. We know that no escape can be found from the curse which has been lying on Europe except by creating and preserving economic health in every country.

Under a system of free economic co-operation Germany must play a part. But here I draw a firm distinction. We must never forget that Germany is the worst master Europe has yet known. Five times in the last century she has violated the peace. She must never be in a position to play that role again. Our political and military terms of peace will be designed to prevent a repetition of Germany's misdeeds.

We cannot now foresee when the end will come. But

it is in the nature of a machine so rigid as the German to break suddenly and with little warning. When it comes, the need of succour to the European peoples will be urgent.

Shipping will be short and local organization in Europe in a state of collapse. It is, therefore, important to begin in good time the discussion of priorities and of allocations. Our friends and allies now represented in London will tell us what their liberated countries will need most urgently, in order that we may all co-operate and be ready for prompt action.

In speaking of the reconstruction of Europe I do not overlook the fact that its settlement may affect and be affected by developments elsewhere, such as, for example, in the Far East. After the unhappy struggle now in progress between Japan and China, there will obviously be problems of similar magnitude to be faced in that part of the world, in the solution of which all countries concerned will, we hope, play their part.

The right economic outcome after the war requires on our part no exceptional unselfishness but will require constructive imagination. It is obvious that we have no motive of self-interest prompting us to the economic exploitation either of Germany or of the rest of Europe. This is not what we want nor what we could perform. The lasting settlement and internal peace of the Continent as a whole is our only aim. The fact that at the bottom of his heart every combatant knows this is the ultimate source of our strength. To every neutral, satellite or conquered country, it is obvious that our victory is, for the most fundamental and unalterable reasons, to their plain advantage. But that victory stands

also for something greater still. Only our victory can restore, both to Europe and to the world, that freedom which is our heritage from centuries of Christian civilization, and that security which alone can make possible the betterment of man's lot upon the earth.

In the tasks that lie ahead may there be given to our statesmen the vision to see, the faith to act, and the courage to persevere.

Necessary Fundamentals *

The recent German atrocities in occupied countries have shocked the world. These are not isolated acts springing from barbarous impulses of individual Nazi soldiers and officials. They represent the policy of the German government which deliberately adopted a policy of terrorism.

The Nazis fully understand the implications of their choice. Thus, in a speech delivered in Berlin on June 15, Goebbels admitted that Germany had severed the bridges which connected her with the world. Germany's rulers have cut themselves off from humanity. These barbarous acts, however, have not accomplished their object. Instead of weakening, they have reinforced the spirit of resistance and strengthened the ties which bind the United Nations together.

Such is our solidarity that a crime against one is felt as a crime against all. We stand united in our resolve to

* Extracts from Mr. Eden's address at Albert Hall, Nottingham, July 23, 1942, reprinted with permission from *Bulletins From Britain* # 101.

exact full and stern retribution at the appointed time. We are working together for victory and beyond. For we haven't been fighting all these years merely to return to a world of fear and hunger and frustrated hopes.

No nation can hope to live alone, we have been taught by the tragedy of the Second World War. The march of invention has brought all nations into the closest relations with one another. Whether it will or not, the world grows ever smaller. We must either build an orderly, law-abiding international society in which each nation lives and works freely without fear or favor, or we shall all be destroyed in a welter of barbaric strife.

If we fail this time, we are not likely to be given another chance. We missed our opportunity after the last war. It would be foolish to suppose that after this war a few favored nations can enclose themselves within a charmed circle and go forward alone. The whole world is awake. Everywhere people are on the march without distinction of race or color.

Industry has reached the stage in which there is no necessity for anyone in the world to go short of food or lack the means to build himself a better life. The problem is to organize full production and equitable distribution for all. Only a decently fed and healthy people can work effectively for a better world. This won't be a short or an easy task; it will require the co-operation of every nation, each according to its capacity and experience.

We must have no illusion about the future, even after the war is won. To win the peace will be as hard a task as to win the war. We will need the same national unity at home. We will need something of the same

spirit of self-denial and sacrifice. We will need true friendship between the nations who have fought as Allies if we are to win through. We are pledged to play our full part in building a peaceful, active international society.

It is therefore most encouraging to note that in the United States the President himself and a number of leading statesmen have repeatedly expressed their determination to work for a world in which each country shall be given the opportunity to develop its own life and its own resources to the benefit of all. In this task, our American friends can be sure we are ready to meet and work with them all the time, all the way.

After the war, the problem of peace will be urgent. We lost the last peace because the nations failed to work for it with the same energy they displayed in the war. We do not dare to make the same mistakes nor take the same risks with Germany again.

Disarmament of the aggressor powers must be complete.

But, then, the first task must be to feed the starving populations. As you may have read, certain steps already taken provide for this event. For instance, in a wheat agreement concluded between the United States, Canada, Australia, the Argentine and Great Britain, a plan has been agreed upon to store and distribute wheat fairly so that the interests of farmers in the producing countries and of the consumers shall both be protected during the interim of the reconstruction period. This agreement also provides for a more permanent arrangement to include other countries when once they are free and able to voice their own needs. This is only a small

part of the problem of the revival of international trade.

There is also the problem of enabling devastated, impoverished and economically undeveloped countries to restart their industry and agriculture, for, until people produce, they cannot purchase what they need. This involves the type of relationship which should exist between highly developed powerful countries and those that have not attained the same level of economic activity or have little experience in self-government.

I feel there are two principles which should govern these relations, not only because they are just principles, but also because they are in accord with the best interests of all.

First, the receipt of financial and economic aid must not result in the loss of independence for any country. Secondly, any form of assistance or guidance given to a country unpractised in the art of self-government must be such as to help it achieve its own development.

There are many complicated and difficult matters to be worked out after the war. They will require not only hard work and much goodwill, but also political invention of the highest order. When new political relationships develop, novel forms of political instruments, or working arrangements, are required to give expression to them.

Sometimes political instruments have been evolved slowly over centuries. Such has been the experience of the British form of government. On other occasions a new political instrument has been invented in one stroke, as, for instance, the American Constitution.

After the last war, the British people invented a new political instrument in the shape of "Dominion Status"

which gave expression to the relations between the peoples of the British Commonwealth. Another political instrument was invented by President Roosevelt recently when he devised the plan of Lend-Lease.

The future of the world will depend on our skill in foreseeing and creating the necessary political machinery after the war. Whole empires have been made or lost by their success or failure to adapt themselves to changing times.

The United Nations are working together for victory. Not before have independent nations co-operated so closely and effectively for a common end. The purpose for which they are fighting is that each and every country shall be able to develop and improve its own life in peace.

This is a task which will call forth all energies at home.

Never again must we tolerate chronic unemployment, extremes of wealth and poverty, slums and the lack of opportunity for so many which disfigured our national life in the past. It will take years of hard work before we have remade our country to our liking, although the Government has already begun to lay the plans for the future, both at home and in the international sphere. Together with the United States, the Soviet Union, China and other nations, we shall take our part in working for the development of a great, world-wide civilization.

For this great work in international relations to thrive, it must be founded on a moral basis. We are fortunate in having special opportunities to found it on that good neighbor policy and to be able to begin it now

at home. To set against the hatred this war has engendered, our small country has been able to make many friendships. As a youthful English poet wrote with juvenile insularity when fretting in Berlin: "For England's the one land I know where men with splendid hearts may go."

Since 1939 it has been our good fortune to welcome men with splendid hearts from different countries. Friendships we have been proud to make have proved we can be good neighbors and good comrades. Now, with the arrival of American armed forces in large numbers in this country, we are entering a new essay in friendship.

I am ambitious that the Americans should establish a consciousness of a comradeship in war that will abide in the peace to come. Its growth will be warmed by stories of heroism like those of the fifteen American torpedo bombers, none of which returned. They pursued and attacked, unprotected, the Japanese navy in the recent victory off Midway Island, where vengeance was taken for Pearl Harbor.

But the comradeship I have in mind cannot be rooted only in the fighting of a common foe, still less in speech-making. It will endure only if the Americans and we find that we care for the same fundamental things—liberty, decency, self-respect and opportunity for the common man—and that we care for them a lot.

The most important question I now see in the sphere of foreign relationships is how American soldiers and airmen will be made happy in our British setting. The future of Anglo-American friendship now for the first time in history is in the hands of the people of this

country. Knowing the great-heartedness and the generosity of our people, I look forward with confidence to the outcome of this great experiment. I pray that out of the accident of war may come the lasting benefit of peace.

Sacrifices for Peace *

When will these leaders of Germany understand that the millions of people in this country and in the British Empire, and indeed throughout the United Nations, are unanimously determined to have no truck of any kind with Hitler or the Nazi regime? Our people are not dulled by propaganda, they are not hypnotized by a myth. They have made their resolve as free men and women, which is something no doubt that Hitler cannot understand. They have counted the cost, and they are willing to pay it in order to re-establish in the world the basis of a free civilization and that respect for international engagements without which there can be no lasting peace.

Except for a few wretched Quislings all the peoples of Europe whose lands have been temporarily overrun by the German armies have the same faith. They continue stubbornly to resist the Nazi and Fascist oppressors with such means as they can command. The German people and Hitler's satellite rulers, Mussolini, Antonescu and others should be in no doubt as to the light in which they are regarded by free men all over the world. The

* Extract from Mr. Eden's speech at Usher Hall, Edinburgh, May 8, 1942.

longer the German people continues to support and to tolerate the regime which is leading them to destruction the heavier grows their own direct responsibility for the damage that they are doing to the world.

Therefore, if any section of the German people really wants to see a return to a German state which is based on respect for law and for the rights of the individual, they must understand that no-one will believe them until they have taken active steps to rid themselves of their present regime.

Meanwhile Hitler's speech has sounded the death knell of the much-vaunted New Order. The New Order is dead. It was never really alive. The New Order was not like Spring, it was never more than Winter, whose icy grasp clamped down death and hunger and disease upon Europe. The New Order will fade away and be forgotten of men.

But this does not mean that we suppose that after the war everything will be the same. Nor that we would wish it so. We shall not awake from this nightmare and find that there in waiting for us the old world that we know. I don't think that many of us would want that world exactly as it was even if we could have it. Certainly I would not want it. We had plenty of good intentions then. Our intentions were excellent. I do not suppose that forty million people, in the whole history of mankind, have ever had such good intentions.

We wanted peace. We wanted kindness. We wanted comfort and prosperity. We wanted, very badly, to be healthy, wealthy, and wise. That was what we wanted.

What we got was something very different. We got unemployment. We got, in a world teeming with riches,

an almost complete breakdown of international trade. We got war. Our good intentions were not enough. Good intentions never *are* enough; unless they are matched with intelligence and vigilance and, beyond everything, unless they are matched by will.

I am speaking to you as Foreign Secretary. And when, as Foreign Secretary, I think of the world after the war I am thinking primarily, of how we shall be able to keep the peace. For me that is the fundamental problem. But it is the fundamental problem for all of us. For without peace, without stability in international relationships, without active co-operation between the peoples of the world, without the removal of the constant threat of war, there is no hope for us anywhere. Without peace we cannot rid ourselves of the recurring scourge of unemployment. Without peace we must look forward to ever falling standards of living, to ever increasing social stress.

When I speak of peace I do not mean simply the absence of war. When Germany and Japan are defeated, whether it be this year, or next, or whenever it may be, the war will come to its end. But that will not mean peace, in the sense in which I am using the word. It is only then, when the war is over, that we shall *begin* to make peace.

When the war comes to an end we shall be faced with the problem, but we shall not have solved it. That will be for the future, and for the long future. We cannot win peace in a day. We cannot win peace in the months of a conference. We cannot win it even in a peace treaty, however careful your draftsmanship.

These are the bones, the skeleton of peace. Only hu-

man will and perseverance can give them flesh and blood. We can only build up peace over long years of effort, of vigilance, above all of determination, of will. We did not make peace last time. How shall we make it now?

First of all I would say, and it is not a hard saying, that we must make sacrifices for peace. It is one of the laws of life, and we need not to be afraid of it, that you do not get something for nothing. Everything has to be paid for somehow, at some time. We have learned that, if we have learned nothing else, in the past twenty-five years. And the first thing that we have to do is to understand, as we did not understand before, that we have a direct and inescapable responsibility for peace at all times. That is a responsibility which is not ours alone. We share it with the other nations of the world. We have continually to revise our understanding of geography.

Before ever this war began the world was shrinking before our eyes. The war has accelerated that process. The world after the war will be a still smaller place. There will be no room for isolation, no room for selfish policies, or unneighborly policies. There will be but one village street from Edinburgh to Chungking.

But because we are a great people our own responsibility is great. We must never neglect our own British interests. But we cannot afford to disinterest ourselves from the interests of other nations. There can be no isolation for the British Empire, ever again. We must assume the burden of leadership. It is a burden which others will share with us. But a great part of the burden is for us.

How are we to discharge this responsibility of leadership which will be ours? First of all, we must give visible proof that we accept the responsibility. We must show not only that we are willing to bear our share in the enforcement of peace. We must show that we have the force and the will to do it.

I am not suggesting another armaments race. I am suggesting that never again shall we so neglect our armaments that we frighten our friends and delight our enemies. I am suggesting that never again shall our weakness give a free hand to the gangsters of Europe and Asia and betray all of those who, like ourselves, seek to work out their own lives in freedom and in peace. And these are, never forget, the overwhelming majority of mankind.

We must show that we can act as well as preach. That will mean sacrifice. But the sacrifice will be light by comparison with the reward. And unless we are prepared for that sacrifice nothing, neither fuller employment nor fuller economic opportunity nor better education nor better housing, nothing will be assured to us.

Peace is more than frontiers and peace treaties. There must be force and will as well. But peace is more than force. And you will never have peace on this earth unless you have an economic system in which men and women who are willing to work are able to work and find the reward of their labors. I said just now that there could be no social advancement without peace. But it is equally true that you will not get peace without social improvement. If there are three million unemployed here, and countless millions of unemployed

in Europe and America and Asia, you will not get peace. If there is unemployment and malnutrition and animal standards of life, and poverty that can be remedied is not remedied, in any part of the world, you will jeopardize peace.

There is first a fundamental need. The United Nations together must possess sufficient force to provide the police to prevent highway robbery and the success of gangster methods. We have to aim at a state of affairs in which the four great world powers represented by the British Commonwealth of Nations, the United States of America, the U.S.S.R. and China will together sustain this peace system. In peace they will look for aid from other peace loving countries, just as they do now in war. But upon them must fall the main burden for the maintenance of peace and the main responsibility for the economic reconstruction of the world after the war.

What is true of our foreign relations is also true of our Colonial Empire. You cannot run a large Colonial Empire well unless you are determined to do so, and unless you are proud to make the necessary sacrifices to carry through the task.

In that period between the two wars, in which our intentions were so excellent and our purpose was so woefully weak, we almost became shy of the fact that we were entrusted with a vast Empire. That must never happen again. I use the word entrusted advisedly. Our purpose in developing our Colonial Empire must not be to gain commercial advantage for ourselves nor to exploit transient material opportunities. Still less should we seek to uproot native habits of life. It must be our privilege to develop our Colonial Empire, to raise the

standard of life of the many races dwelling in it, to gain their confidence, their trust, their free collaboration in the work we have both to do. This means that men and women must be ready to give up their working lives to this service. This same Colonial Empire has given us the lives and work of many of its sons and daughters during the war. We pledge ourselves not to fail them in the period after the war.

I have not concealed from you the formidable nature of the problems that the future holds. But I would not have you believe on that account that I am a pessimist for the post-war period. We have heard much of Hitler's strength-through-joy movement, and we don't think much of that. But I am no advocate of a strength-through-misery movement. We can find our own happiness in our own way by the dedication of our working lives to the cause for which we have taken up arms, the sanctity of the pledged word and freedom and opportunity for our fellow men.

Scientists and Construction of Post-War World

By SIR STAFFORD CRIPPS, former Lord Privy Seal, and leader of the House of Commons for the Churchill Government, now Minister for Aircraft Production.

My association with science and with scientific personages has been a long one; ever since I deserted the attractions of a Science Scholarship at Oxford for the even greater attractions of working for three years under

the late Sir William Ramsey at University College, London. Throughout my years of professional experience at the Bar—now finally closed—I was continually engaged in scientific cases of the widest variety and I had many opportunities of working with inventors and expert witnesses in every branch of science. Some of you may perhaps think that such an experience does not give a contact with what is best in the scientific world; but whatever else it does, it certainly brings a realization of the wide ramifications of science in our modern ways of life, and of the great part which scientists must play in the progress of our civilization.

The scientific lawyer is continuously trying to interpret to lay minds the contributions of science to industry and to explain the relation between scientific theory and production. Sometimes his efforts entail an appreciation of the most complicated scientific facts—as, for instance, in the case of the gyro-compass—and often it is necessary for him to concert with the experts long scientific investigations and researches. I well remember one case in which a special establishment was set up for carrying out these researches and many tens of thousands of experiments were carried out in order to try and ascertain the true theoretical basis for what, upon the face of it, appeared to be quite a simple invention. All this experience brings an understanding of the part which research and pure science plays in our life today.

The growth of technical knowledge and personnel has brought a problem to our democracy which is as yet unsolved. It was truly said two years ago by a group of American professors that “technical invention and progress had outstripped social and political invention.”

We still have to devise some means by which we can fit into our democratic organization the technical expert and the technician so as to make the most of their contribution.

I do not personally believe in government by specialists, but government without the aid of specialists is today an impossibility. We do not want to see our Parliament composed of experts and technicians, for Parliament should have what has sometimes been termed the "common jury" type of mind—the mind that can form a general judgment upon problems of wide political import, though often that judgment must be formed upon the basis of scientific evidence or technical knowledge.

The ever-widening sphere of our knowledge, with the necessity which it imposes for a more and more narrow specialization, renders it increasingly impossible for any single individual to survey accurately the whole field of those influences and considerations which must determine our policies.

That scientists will and must play a most vital and distinguished part in the construction of the post-war world is certain, but we still have to devise suitable methods by which their contribution can be facilitated and can become most effective. It is good to observe that science is no longer regarded by the people as something divorced and separate from their general life. The connection between science, economics and politics is beginning to be realized, and how close that connection must be is well demonstrated by the range of questions which have been under discussion in the course of your present meetings and which were dealt

with at the British Association meetings on "Science and the World Order" in September last.

The title of the present series of meetings brings together the scientific facts as regards mineral resources and the political objectives laid down in the Atlantic Charter. This Charter was an attempt to express in general and easily understood terms the direction in which the political leaders of the democracies envisaged world progress after victory had been won and freedom of spirit and of action had been restored to the peoples of the world. Hitherto, no more precise definition of those objectives or of the means by which they are to be obtained has been possible, but it is clear that in their application a multitude of questions will be raised—political, economic and scientific—which will require the best brains of the world for their solution. A number of America's leaders have recently made statements expressing their views as regards some of the implications which arise out of the Atlantic Charter, and I would like to remind you of a few of their phrases in order to indicate the line on which they are developing the fundamental principles of the Charter.

President Roosevelt: "The basic things expected by our people of their political and economic systems are simple; they are:

Equality of opportunity for youth and for others;
Jobs for those who can work;
Security for those who need it;
The ending of special privilege for the few;
The preservation of civil liberties for all."

Mr. Cordell Hull in his speech of Thursday last has said: "The pledge of the Atlantic Charter is of a system

which will give every nation, large or small, greater assurance of a stable peace, greater opportunity for the realization of its aspirations to freedom, and greater facilities for material advancement.

"A vast fund of resources will be released for each nation to meet the needs of progress, to make possible for all its citizens' advancement towards higher living standards, and to invigorate constructive forces of initiative and enterprise."

Mr. Henry Wallace: "No nation will have the God-given right to exploit other nations. Older nations will have the privilege to help the younger nations get started on the path of industrialization, but there must be neither military nor economic imperialism."

Mr. Sumner Welles: "Given sound national policies directed towards the benefit of the majority and not of the minority and real security and equality of opportunity for all."

Mr. Milo Perkins: "The job of the future will be to build up a mass consumption great enough to use this mass production. This will require a bold and daring use of long term credits by every enlightened Government of the world. Governments must enter fields where private finance cannot enter."

The Hon. Dean Acheson calls for united action by all nations correlating for this purpose international and domestic measures, to expand production, employment and the exchange and consumption of goods.

The Foreign Secretary in his remarkable speech two days ago has welcomed these statements of American leaders in these words: "It is, therefore, most encouraging to note that in the United States of America the

President himself and a number of leading statesmen have repeatedly expressed a determination to work for a world in which each country shall be given an opportunity to develop its own life and its own resources to the benefit of all. In this task our American friends can be sure that we shall be ready to meet and work with them all the time and all the way.

"There are many complicated and difficult matters to be worked out after the war; they will require not only hard work and much goodwill, but also political invention of a very high order. For, when new political relationships develop, novel forms of political instruments, or working arrangements, are required to give expression to them."

These statements are the beginnings of an interpretation of the generalities of the Atlantic Charter into the more detailed objectives which policy makers must have in view in working out their programmes. We should all of us agree with the broad objectives set out in these speeches especially those of President Roosevelt, and it is encouraging to realize that there is such a body of leaders in America with whom we shall willingly collaborate along the paths which they indicate. But the implication of these simple phrases is tremendous both from an economic, political and scientific point of view, and prolonged and careful study will be required to devise the ways and means by which the objectives can, in practice, be gained.

It must not be imagined that we in this country are behindhand in thinking out these problems. A great mass of research and investigation is under way both in Government circles and amongst non-official bodies

and individuals. Your own activities in this direction are a most valuable contribution, in a period when public opinion is slowly being formed on these questions of the future. But beyond these technical investigations there is another aspect of this problem which must never be lost sight of.

We may make the most careful plans, work out the most detailed methods, call in the help of scientists, economists and politicians, but all this will be of no avail unless there is in the peoples of all nations a determination to succeed, a spirit of co-operation and a ruthless insistence that we should make the common good of humanity the over-riding inspiration of our policies. We are fighting for a moral and not merely a material issue. Though our plans must be scientifically prepared there must be behind them the inspiration of our most deeply religious convictions. The magnitude of our task calls for the utmost of our idealism.

If we were to drop back into the old competitive struggle between nations or between corporations in the attempt to win national monopolies for world resources, then no planning could succeed. Rival plans would be formulated and the more elaborate they were the greater and more destructive would be the rivalry between them. One thing is sure, that the United Nations must, at the end of the war, undertake international regulation of the production and distribution of essential raw materials, both in the interests of the immediate rehabilitation of the devastated countries as well as with a view to attaining that steadily rising standard of living throughout the world which is one of our objectives. It is too early as yet to lay down

finally the form that such a regulative system should take. This is one of the matters which requires exploration and which must be worked out by common agreement amongst the United Nations. •

I am very glad to see upon your agenda for today the discussion of a project for an International Resources Organization which would mobilize all the knowledge available in the world concerning raw materials and natural resources and also of the technique of their use. I am certain that your discussion and your conclusions on this matter will be of great help to those who will be charged with the work of agreeing upon some such organization; for it is certain that the world can no longer afford—as indeed we have found in our war effort—to leave this great question of natural resources and their utilization to the haphazard methods of individual action and economic nationalism.

Science in its search for and development of knowledge has long exemplified the international and co-operative side of human activities. There is indeed a healthy spirit of competitive achievement in the scientific field, in the sense that every scientist would like to see his own nation in the forefront of scientific research and development. But all equally rejoice in every fresh advance, in each conquest over the forces of nature, and the results of their achievement are made available for the benefit of all the peoples.

This pooling of knowledge in the field of research, discovery and invention we must now translate into co-operative action in the distribution, manufacture and use of the resulting commodities.

Scientists of all kinds have worked together to dis-

cover the mineral resources of the world and to make available to the peoples these resources through the application of the technique of mining and of processing so as to improve the standard of life and comfort of mankind as a whole. Their work has not been aimed in the main at advantaging any particular class of people whether geographic or economic.

It is in the application of the work of the scientists that we have so far failed, in the distribution of the benefits which they have made available.

This war, like its predecessor, is a stage in the efforts of the peoples of the world to readjust themselves to new economic and social conditions and in that sense it must be revolutionary in its effect upon our civilization. It will only be by learning the lessons of our past maladjustment and by taking steps to bring our political, social and economic developments into line with our scientific advance, in every field of human activity, that we shall avoid the need for yet another revolutionary upheaval after this war is over. This is a task in which all the great nations must co-operate since today, despite all attempts to create autarchies, we are essentially inter-dependent one on another.

In war we have learned the need, the urgent and vital need, for co-ordinated and planned action if we are to win a victory. We have today reached a degree of co-operation between the united nations in the use of raw material resources and in the employment of finished products greater than has ever been reached before in the history of the world. Selfish and national interests have been over-ridden by the insistent demand for efficiency by the fighting peoples. They have learned

by bitter experience that co-operation and co-ordination are vital to their survival. Will these be any less vital to the construction of a sound and safe civilization after the victory has been won? The answer is most certainly "No." The difficulties will be no less, the dangers of chaos and confusion will be as great and the steps which we must take to avoid these must be along the same lines that we have adopted in the war.

For the purpose of war we have built up a great store of knowledge and of practice which we must be prepared to use for the winning of the peace. We must turn our machinery of economic warfare into one of economic welfare.

When I speak of "we" I am not referring to the British people alone. The whole essence of our action in this field must be co-operation with others both in development and in use. It is therefore essential that problems such as those which are before you today should be considered and worked out on the international plane, though we can and must in each nation make our own contribution to the formulation of such policies and plans. The greater we can make our own national contribution, not in preserving benefits for ourselves but in making the whole pool of natural resources widely available for all peoples, the prouder shall we be of our part in the progress of human development.

It is perhaps necessary to say a word as to the difficulty which arises in the minds of some people as to the interrelation of such an international policy to our own purely national interests. Beyond doubt our first duty as Britishers is to our own people; so to organize our economy and our resources as to give them a decent and

happy standard of life; to provide them with a good and equal education and to see that none are overpressed in making their individual contribution to our production effort. In a world economy where there was a shortage of natural resources this duty to our own people might compel us to some extent to enter into competition for those natural resources with the peoples of other nations. But the gift of science to the world is that it has shown the way to attain an economy of plenty: it has discovered where the natural wealth of the world is to be found and how it may be transformed into those things which the people need for their living.

That knowledge is not the monopoly of any country, for it has been made available to all the world. There is therefore now no necessity for competition in a world of scarcity to win a decent standard of livelihood for our people. If we make our full contribution to the productive resources of the world, and other countries do the same, there can be enough for all. Two wars have already proved to us what organization and planning can do to increase our capacity to produce. They have provided a demonstration and a proof of the possibility of plenty which the free peoples of the world must never forget.

Perhaps the most revolutionary element in our war experience is this revelation of an almost unlimited capacity for production in the mutually destructive effort of war and the growing realization that this great productive capacity can equally be organized for the purposes of peace, if only we are so prepared to plan our economy as to make it available.

Neither we nor any other nation must attempt to

erect ourselves—as Hitler is striving to do with Germany—into a privileged people living upon the labor and the efforts of other—as he would call them—sub-human peoples. His conception of a “*Herrenvolk*,” which lies at the root of the Nazi philosophy, is a demand for special privileges and special standards, won not by the productive effort of the Germans themselves but by their conquest and enslavement of all the neighboring races.

It is against this conception that we are today fighting, and the Atlantic Charter is the expression of our conviction that the natural resources of the world are now adequate—if wisely used—to provide a decent standard of life for all the peoples, and that all are therefore entitled to their fair share in these resources.

We must not, however, underestimate the difficulties of those words “if wisely used.” We must frankly admit that in the past we have not succeeded in achieving a wise use of our resources and that therefore we shall need new methods and new organizations if the principles of the Atlantic Charter are to become a reality and not remain, as have so many good resolutions in the past, nothing but pious aspirations.

The road upon which we must make this advance we have to some extent already plotted, and indeed we have actually proceeded along it in developing the plans of the United Nations for their war effort. It is nothing less than the subordination of private and national interests to the public and international good. What is needed now is a common determination amongst the people of the free nations to adopt this principle of action by which alone we can attain the objectives of the

Atlantic Charter as elaborated by President Roosevelt in the passage I have already quoted and not under any circumstances to revert to the unsuccessful methods of the past. There must be a determined change of outlook from that of competition to that of co-operation. This is not an easy transition to make, but scientists who have been brought up in an atmosphere of international co-operative development can, I am sure, do much, by their example and by their advice, to create this new and challenging spirit among the free peoples of the world.

The British Labor Party's Plan to Win The Peace*

The annual conference of the British Labor Party is attended by delegates from the trade unions, socialist societies, the Co-operative Society and the constituency labor parties—representing in all about 3,000,000 people.

From 1906 when the party was formed until 1918 the membership was confined to actual members of unions or of specific socialist societies, who pressed in Parliament for specific social and industrial reforms. But in 1918 a manifesto, *The New Social Order*, was issued and laid down a Labor Party policy for government as a whole. The membership was then thrown open to any individual who accepted these principles and the party became a national political organization, equipped to form the recognized opposition and prepared to take the responsibility of government.

From the outbreak of the war, the annual conference has coupled with its declaration to fight "until Nazism and

* Reprinted with permission from *Bulletins from Britain*, June 10, 1942.

Fascism are overthrown," its determination to work for a reconstructed world and its belief that "the world is a single economic unit" for which "we must have international economic planning" (1941). The following report strengthens and confirms previous affirmations.

AN ABRIDGED VERSION OF THE BRITISH LABOR PARTY'S
INTERIM REPORT ON RECONSTRUCTION

What has occurred since September 3, 1939, has left it [the British people] adamant in its resolution to destroy its ruthless enemy, and with it those other governments, European and Asiatic alike, which share its foul purposes. For the grim months that have passed since Hitler embarked upon his self-chosen task of dominating the whole world have made it clear that any peace with him or his associates in infamy would be meaningless.

The British Labor Party will refuse all negotiations with the Hitler Government or those satellite governments with which it is in so ugly an association. It will insist upon the decisive destruction alike of the power of German militarism and those kindred instruments upon which it has relied, both in the East and the West, for the accomplishment of world domination. The Labor Party will, moreover, insist that those who have been responsible for the barbarities which a hundred years will remember with shame shall not escape the punishment their commission involved.

No party is more fully aware than the British Labor Party that this war makes a crisis in our civilization as profound as that of the Reformation and the French Revolution. The first act was the war of 1914; and men

hoped when peace came that the lesson of its sufferings had been learned. The hope proved vain; and this tragedy has swept over mankind because in the years between 1918 and 1939 the forces of privilege refused, where they could, to admit the need for vital change.

They sought to meet the social and economic problems of the twentieth century with ideas which already were obsolete. They refused to recognize that a democratic civilization is incompatible, under the conditions of modern science and technology, with either the parochialism of national sovereignty on the one hand, or the confinement of freedom on the other, to those whose possession of property gave them, and them alone, access to economic security. That refusal meant a civilization which, for most, was careless of equity and justice. The inequity of the system was plainly demonstrated in the years of the great depression. . . . "Appeasement" almost sacrificed the liberties of the world to those vested interests which had for so long been careless either of equity or of justice.

The British Labor Party is bound to lay emphasis upon the period of the inter-war years because its analysis leads to certain important lessons:

1. An unplanned society is unable to maintain a reasonable standard of life for a large number of its citizens.

2. An unplanned society, in which the essential instruments of production are privately owned, is compelled to think overwhelmingly in terms of private profit. In the inter-war years this meant a policy of restriction instead of a policy of expansion. It meant mass unemployment.

3. Because the ability of privately-owned capital to earn profit for its owners was the main motive to accumulation and investment, an unplanned society developed a vested interest, on the part of the owners of capital, in maintaining systems which, like those of Hitler and Mussolini, destroyed democracy in the service of German and Italian privilege.

4. The Labor Party is bound, moreover, to note that as soon as the nation became involved in war it became imperative to plan the national life, and to subordinate private interests to the overriding claim of victory.

Given victory, the approach of the Labor Party to the problems of reconstruction is set by the significance it attaches to these plain lessons. They have validity in the sphere of both national and international relations. Our victory will leave us facing an emergency not less profound than the prospect we have been set by the struggle with Hitlerism.

We must confront that emergency in the spirit which alone makes victory possible, the spirit which [has] recognized that no private interest has the right to set limits to the claims of the nation, that no single nation can pit its claims against the overriding rights of all mankind.

We have, therefore, in the judgment of the Labor Party to set out now, as a deliberate part of our war effort, to organize for four things:

1. We have to provide full employment.
2. We have to rebuild a Britain to standards worthy of the men and women who have preserved it.
3. We have to organize social services at a level which

secures adequate health, nutrition, and care in old age, for all citizens.

4. We have to provide educational opportunities for all which insure that our cultural heritage is denied to none.

Unless we do these things there will be, after the war, a repetition of mass-unemployment, the re-emergence of distressed areas, a rebuilding of Britain made mean and inadequate by the surrender of public good to private interest. The Labor Party does not believe that the nation will accept peacefully a return to these conditions. They would endanger the whole purpose for which we are fighting.

The Labor Party asks that we register now, as a nation, our recognition that this war has already, socially and economically, effected a revolution in the world as vast, in its ultimate implications, as that which marked the replacement of feudalism by capitalism. All over the world the evidence is abundant that this revolution has deeply affected men's minds; our central problem is to discover its appropriate institutions, above all, if we can, to discover them by consent. The world is now aware, as the President of the United States has insisted, that the foundations of a strong and healthy democracy have nothing mysterious about them.

"The basic things," he has said, "expected by our people of their political and economic systems are simple. They are:

- "1. Equality of opportunity for youth and for others.
- "2. Jobs for those who can work.
- "3. Security for those who need it.
- "4. The ending of special privileges for the few.

"5. The preservation of civil liberties for all.

"6. The enjoyment of the fruits of scientific progress in a wider and constantly rising standard of living."

The Labor Party accepts these objectives; it observes that, by implication, the British Government accepted them when it indorsed the Atlantic Charter. It agrees with President Roosevelt that "the inner and abiding strength of our economic and political systems is dependent upon the degree to which they fulfill these expectations."

It accepts his plea for the necessity of the four essential human freedoms—"freedom of speech and expression, religious freedom, freedom from want, and freedom from fear, everywhere in the world." It agrees with him, also, that "this is no vision of a distant millennium. It is a definite basis for a kind of world attainable in our time and generation."

The Labor Party is bound to remark that the pre-war economic and social system denied these things, not merely to the mass of mankind, but also to the great majority of our own citizens, in this, the second richest nation in the world. It denied them because they could not be attained by a system in which private profit and not public need was the motive power upon which it rested.

We are able to plan for victory only because we have limited the right of private profit to direct our war effort. If, when hostilities cease, it is allowed to resume its previous authority, it will deny these things once more. In the view of the Labor Party, therefore, we have arrived at a stage where fundamental economic and social transformation must begin.

The Labor Party does not ask for some sudden and overnight transformation of our society. It proposes here only the basis upon which the nation can begin forthwith to build. But the acceptance of this basis entails, at once, certain consequences; for it is clear that there are certain instruments of production without the ownership and control of which by the community no planned production for the ends we seek can be attempted seriously.

The Labor Party therefore urges that the nation must own and operate the essential instruments of production; their power over our lives is too great for them to be left in private hands.

The Labor Party continues to affirm that in all colonial territories the primary object of the administration must be the well-being, education and development of the native inhabitants and their training in every possible way so that they may be able in the shortest possible time to govern themselves. In other words, the interests of those inhabitants are and must remain paramount, and of those interests Parliament is the trustee.

The negation of this policy for which the Party stands is the policy of the color bar, the object and effect of which are to insure by law, administration, and every other available means that the native inhabitant is given a different and subordinate status, civil and social, from that of the European. It is in Africa that the color bar as a "native policy" can be seen in its most undisguised form, but it does, less evilly, but more insidiously, affect British colonial policy in other continents. The Labor Party is absolutely opposed to the color bar in every shape and form.

The Labor Party is deeply concerned that, in a war for freedom and democracy, a settlement shall be arrived at with India, which enables all its citizens to devote their full energies to the common struggle. It has noted with satisfaction that all Indian parties are united in their condemnation of Hitlerism. The British Government has announced that it will not itself be a bar in the way of Indian self-government, once agreement is reached between the different interests in India. But the Labor Party believes that it is also the duty of the British Government to take every possible step to promote that agreement.

Just as the issues of domestic reconstruction are bound up with our actual ways of waging the war, so international peace very largely depends on the understanding we reach before victory with our allies and above all with the Soviet Union and the United States. The Labor Party regards it as imperative that we should agree with them upon a united strategy in the conduct of the war, and common ends in the making of the peace.

Neither will be possible unless we see that common action is the outcome of common interest, and that their full defense requires common decisions. Our partnership in war can, if properly organized, be the basis of an international experiment from the experience of which a creative peace may emerge.

These are the conditions of the problem as the Labor Party sees them. They involve certain obvious conclusions.

1. Aggressor nations, after military defeat, must be disarmed and kept disarmed.

2. The principle of collective security against aggression must be given its appropriate methods and institutions.

3. The Labor Party expresses the strong view that no principle of collective security, in its full and proper sense, can hope for permanent acceptance unless it is based on the recognition of the interdependence of nations. This will mean the control of armaments and armed forces by the direct power of the international authority.

4. The Labor Party further emphasizes the importance, in building a new international authority for peace and justice between states of using to the full the experience in collaboration gained in the various organs of the League of Nations.

5. The Labor Party emphasizes the importance, in the building of peace, of utilizing to the full the special experience of international collaboration which has emerged in this war. Common action for defense; common planning in investment and distribution, for the utilization of raw materials, for the full interchange of scientific knowledge and personnel; all of this has proved fruitful and important.

6. The Labor Party notes with strong approval the declaration in the Atlantic Charter that the peoples of the enemy countries shall, after their defeat, nevertheless share in the prosperity it is sought to organize by the common effort of all nations.

7. The Labor Party recognizes that, as the Axis governments begin to crumble, widespread revolution is certain in the countries they now dominate. It declares its view that each people is entitled to determine its

own form of government subject only to its obligation to accept and respect the Four Freedoms and the international implications to which they lead.

8. Finally, the Labor Party is bound to emphasize that the power of democracy in the future to maintain international peace is, in the long run, inseparable from the growth, in each country, of the common ownership of the main instruments of production and their co-ordinated planning for common ends.

GREECE

War and Peace *

By ANDRÉ MICHALOPOULOS, *Greek Minister of Information.*

The ghastly scream of dive-bombers, the crash and thunder of high-explosives, the roar of powerful aero-engines accompanied by the murderous rattle of machine-guns in action leave an impression which is not easily forgotten. Such were the conditions prevailing around me when I left Pireus, the port of Athens, on the evening of April 23rd last year to go to Crete where the Greek forces made their last stand on the ancient soil of Hellas.

But another impression, even more vivid in its horror, has remained with me and this I know I shall never forget. On the next day, two German bombers sank the small ship in which I was sailing, off a desert island half-way between the mainland and Crete. After the fatal bomb had exploded amidships, the gallant Nazi airmen glided down to sea-level to finish off their work with an epilogue of machine-gun fire. The ship had been split in two and had gone down: many lives had been lost and a number of men were grievously wounded: more were struggling in the water. Goering's chivalrous knights of the air leaned out of their craft

* Reprinted with permission from *The Christian Science Monitor*, Sept. 19, 1942.

soaring a few feet above our heads and viciously enjoyed the grim scene. They grinned at us triumphantly, waved their hands, opened their throttles and zoomed up and away through the clear sky.

It was one of those springtime evenings which in Greece are a glory. A soft breeze was blowing over a placid, azure sea. I remember that in the vivid emotion of the moment by a freak of fancy two lines from Milton flashed through my brain:

"The air was calm and on the level brine
Sleek Panope and all her sisters played."

And as we gathered on the shore, marooned and helpless, before us stretched, ageless and lovely, Homer's vast unharvested sea bearing in its bosom its countless myths and legends. One more had been added to the score. Lurid indeed, and as a full moon rose over this scene of human misery, the foul, disgusting grin of those young Nazi savages fixed itself forever in my mind. And when the time for peace-talk comes I am not disposed to forget it.

Let there be no mistake: this is a war between two ideologies: it cannot be and must not be dismissed with a mere slogan: "Fighting for Democracy and Freedom": we are indeed fighting for these two basic principles of civilization but a danger lies in the too facile acceptance of terms we have for a long time past taken for granted. Now the Germans have come to remind us that we cannot take Democracy and Freedom for granted. They have come—these black angels of evil, trumpeting their loathsome New Order of murder, violence and starvation—to prove to us with their tanks and bombers, their

fire and brimstone, that Democracy is an effete and obsolete system and that Freedom is but an illusion.

We in Greece have shown them, and are showing them that it would take very much more than their orgy of mechanized devilry to convince us. For four thousand years we have been fighting on that minuscule but magnificent strip of rugged land which we love more than anything on earth, to defend our civilization, which has become yours, against a long succession of barbarian invaders: we have been overwhelmed before now but never in all our history has the spirit of the Greek people been broken.

Perhaps then we are without presumption entitled to say to America, this great country where true freedom and democracy have been established and have remained unchallenged for so many years: "Beware of your prosperity: it is the reward of freedom: it can also become its most insidious enemy." The younger generation of America cannot imagine what slavery means: they cannot conceive of its existence. Let them be constantly reminded of the hard and noble struggle of their forefathers against the forces of nature and the designs of men. In blood and toil and tribulation they paid a heavy price in order that their sons might live and prosper as free men. But, (today freedom is everywhere in peril. Does every American man and woman in this mighty land realize this?) I wish they could have seen the fiendish grin on the faces of those two young Nazi fliers.

I am not suggesting that America is not marshalling her strength and gathering her resources for the grim fight which lies ahead. The war effort of this country

is stupendous and its reserves immense. They are certainly sufficient to win the war, and behind them lies the will and determination of the people of the United States to prosecute the struggle to its only possible conclusion—total victory. What appears still to be lacking in some quarters is the sense of peril and the sense of urgency.

If the Greeks in Greece and those serving in the forces of the Middle East—if we were not all firmly convinced that the United Nations are determined to fight this war to the bitter and victorious end, what would be the point of carrying on the struggle so stubbornly?

In the wild mountains of Greece today, on Rhodope, on Parnassus, on Taygetos, in Crete, brave highland warriors are battling against tremendous odds because they prefer to die free men rather than live as slaves.

In the Middle East the Greek Navy, the Greek Air Force, and the Army of two brigades, whose ranks are being daily swollen with new recruits escaping from Greece, are fighting with conviction under the blue and white standard of Hellas, which has always been the standard of freedom.

They know that liberty will again rise over the earth and that the dawn of the new world is breaking in the west.

And when freedom has been dearly won and an exhausted world lays down its arms, what of the peace?

We are the occupied nations of Europe who have seen our lands ravaged, our homes destroyed, our brothers killed, our wives maltreated, our children starved, say with determination that there must be Justice first. Justice—not vengeance. But Justice stern, relentless,

complete. Hitler and his confederates must be killed: the Gauleiters, the Commanders, the Officers, the Sergeants, the men who have been the agents of death to hundreds of thousands of innocent men and women, must be killed. After their individual guilt has been established. Thus only will there be some hope of Hitler's greatest crime being expiated, and of real peace eventually returning to the world. For Hitler's principal crime is not that he has waged war ruthlessly over the whole world: it is that by the brutal ferocity of his system, by his mass murders of helpless victims he has instilled so virulent a poison of hatred into the hearts of the peoples of Europe that the danger of terrible reprisals is in truth deadly. This criminal fanatic has indeed destroyed something very sacred in the relationship between nation and nation and between man and man. That is why the necessity for immediate, uncompromising justice becomes imperative.

When this task has been accomplished the statesmen of the world will be confronted with the arduous task of settling the peace. The United Nations are committed to the Atlantic Charter, and its very broad base offers to all civilized peoples principles which they cannot refuse to accept, and which, in fact, have been willingly accepted. But it is one thing to enunciate principles and another to apply them. The confusion and misery which will prevail at the end of the war will present the sponsors of the Charter with a stupendous problem. And America and Great Britain will have to face the grave responsibilities of their leadership. The price of greatness is the obligation to sustain it.

Some of the smaller nations which so enthusiastically

endorsed President Wilson's magnanimous program during the last war may perhaps be forgiven if their enthusiasm—genuine in itself—for the principles of the Atlantic Charter is tempered with some misgivings as to manner of its eventual endorsement by the great powers.

Greece is too small a country to be able at the present moment to predict or formulate in any detail a scheme or policy for the future of the Balkans and the Eastern Mediterranean. She can only promise her loyal support for any universal international scheme in application of the principles of the Charter which the United Nations agree to adopt. This is no vague undertaking. Her past record is the guarantee of her future solidarity.

As a member of the League of Nations she always proved herself scrupulously loyal to her obligations under the Covenant.

In 1923, at Lausanne, while the great powers of Europe were haggling over the Mediterranean advantages that might accrue to each of them from the Greek disaster, Greece, on the initiative of Eleutherios Venizelos, and Turkey, on the initiative of Kemal Ataturk, definitely laid aside a bitter quarrel which had separated these two nations for over four centuries. This at least was constructive work.

Since then and up to the outbreak of the present war, Greece, Turkey, Jugoslavia, with the somewhat spineless assistance of Rumania, have been collaborating in developing the Balkan Entente. This Entente was handicapped in its principal aim—the stabilization of peace in the Balkans—by two main obstacles. The first was that it did not go far enough in the direction of elimi-

nating trade barriers and pooling political assets, and in fact was mostly theoretical in these respects, and the second was the non-inclusion of Bulgaria.

It was always the intention of the members of the Balkan Entente to collaborate with Bulgaria and not to encircle her, but this stubborn and unfriendly neighbor repeatedly and deliberately repudiated every advance—and there were many—preferring to serve German interests and to rely on the eventual support of the Axis when war should come—as it has.

If there were any doubts as to the accuracy of this statement, the Bulgarian Premier, M. Bogdan Filov, in his address to the National Assembly in Sofia on November 19, 1941, made the situation quite clear when he said:

The policy of peace and neutrality which the government of Bulgaria has followed since the outbreak of the present war has been dictated by the interests of the nation and corresponds with the interests of the Axis powers. Bulgaria is a small nation, but, even so, her action has without doubt wrecked the much-discussed plan of a Balkan bloc. It was because of Bulgaria's firm attitude that this bloc never materialized, and thus a scheme, the object of which was the formation of hundreds of divisions to fight against the Germans, was foiled. This fact emphatically proves that Bulgaria followed this policy in order to maintain harmony among the Axis powers.

As late as January 15th, of the present year the Governments of Greece and Jugoslavia in London signed for a Balkan Union which marks a very great advance upon all previous instruments of a similar nature in that both its scope and its appeal to mutual confidence and solidarity are much wider. The clause inviting the

eventual adherence of other Balkan States demonstrates the constructive intentions of the signatories.

Thus Greece has surely shown that she maintains herself in the vanguard of Freedom not only on the field of battle but also in the prickly fields of international diplomacy.

But Greece together with all the smaller nations of the world—particularly those which have been devastated by Axis savagery—is anxiously-awaiting the solution which America and Great Britain will give to the problem of the future of Germany, Italy and their lustful satellites.

It is this solution which will afford the measure of the qualifications of these great democratic powers to retain the world leadership which the free nations readily accord them. The guarantees which the Atlantic Charter extends to the peoples of the aggressor powers are indeed worthy of respect and will be respected by all the signatories of that instrument. But the power to harm, the will to destroy of nations which independently of their present infamous rulers have repeatedly proved themselves aggressive in the past, must be finally and completely eradicated.

Let the Axis peoples be permitted to live if they accept to live in honor, but they must be permanently and effectively disarmed, and for a quarter of a century at least they must be deprived of their political independence, if they are to be afforded the economic assistance necessary to their physical existence. Germany, Italy, and Bulgaria and Hungary must be subjected to some form of effective international control if their power for evil is to be eliminated: and that is

but a small price to ask for the abominable crimes they have committed.

If some such policy is followed there is yet hope for democratic civilization. But if, after the war, each nation is going to gather itself up within the narrow folds of its individual isolationism: if history is to repeat itself and if Great Britain and the United States of America in the name of blind idealism or vigilant vested interests are once more destined to finance Germany for the preparation of her next war, then we in Greece have but one thing to do: We shall reverently gather the bones of our glorious dead, we shall carry them to the sacred hill of the Acropolis and burn them in the Parthenon, that shrine of liberty whose ruined columns have been our pride, our comfort and our inspiration for so many centuries, and we shall turn and destroy our temples and our gods and cry with Julian the Apostate:

Χαμαὶ πέσε δαίδαλος αὐλά.

"The lovely edifice hath been utterly destroyed."

INDIA

The Fundamentals of Lasting Peace

By SIR MUHAMMED ZAFRULLA KHAN, K.C.S.I., *Judge of the Federal Court of India, and until recently Agent General for India in China.*

With the winning of victory in the field, we must prepare ourselves to grapple with the problems of peace. These are likely to impose an even heavier strain upon world statesmanship than the war is imposing upon the leadership and resources of the Allied Nations. For the successful solution of these problems, the first essential is the education of public opinion throughout the world, as the psychological front is going to be the most important one in the immediate postwar period.

The world is going to be a very much smaller place after the war than it has been hitherto. Nations will in the future, have to live very much closer together than they have done in the past and must begin to prepare themselves for readjustments that are bound to be entailed. Closer contacts between different sections of the human family will afford opportunities of better understanding, but may also give rise to misunderstandings, friction and irritation. Postwar conditions will enable every one of us to enrich our lives in many respects; they will also require us to make much larger contributions towards the common fund of human welfare. This

realization must go very deep if nations are to live at peace with each other hereafter.

It follows that we must in our respective spheres develop a deep sense of benevolent tolerance. The pattern of human life is extraordinarily rich and varied and it should be our endeavor to preserve and promote this richness and variety under healthy conditions of growth rather than seek to impose a drab uniformity of patterns and standards. The greater the depth and sincerity of our attachment to our own ideals, the greater should be our tolerance and respect for the ideals of our fellow beings.

We must next create a sense of international confidence not only in our aims and objectives, but also in the methods that we intend to adopt for their achievement and the speed at which we intend to travel towards them. Declarations like the Atlantic Charter are, no doubt necessary preliminaries for this purpose, but even during the progress of hostilities, we must not stop short merely at declarations, but must proceed to give concrete proof, in whichever direction it may be possible, of the complete sincerity of our intentions. The peace that followed the last war has shaken men's confidence in general declarations of benevolence and goodwill and that confidence will not be re-established until those for whose benefit such declarations are made, are convinced by practical proof that those on whose behalf they are made are willing voluntarily to forego advantages and to make concessions to implement these declarations. Some sort of machinery must be set up to study and investigate the problems that are likely to arise in the application of these general dec-

larations to the concrete conditions of the world as we are likely to find them at the moment of the cessation of hostilities.

Before we are able to proceed to the settlement of the peace, there will be large problems which will require immediate solution if humanity is to be safeguarded against a great deal of suffering and misery. These problems are related to the feeding and provisioning of very large areas and populations and the setting up of the machinery of civil administration in countries which have been occupied by the aggressor nations during the course of the war and, indeed, under certain eventualities, in some of the aggressor countries themselves. It would not be too soon for the Allied Nations to set about immediately organizing machinery for dealing with these problems and that machinery must be ready to start functioning in each area from which the aggressor nations are progressively evicted.

With regard to the peace itself, whatever shape concrete arrangements may be given, certain fundamentals must be adhered to, for if they are overlooked, the peace that we may establish after this war may prove as uneasy and illusory as the one that was sought to be established after the last war.

The first of these fundamentals is that nations that have been politically dominant in the recent past must reconcile themselves to the fact that the era of racial dominance and discrimination has passed forever. If this is not fully realized and accepted and every one of them is not prepared to make adjustments and what might appear to be sacrifices in accordance therewith, the seeds of racial bitterness and discord will continue

to germinate and will in time fructify into another world conflagration even more horrifying than the one which we are trying to put out just now.

The doctrine of racial superiority which has found its extreme manifestation in Nazi ideology has formed the basis of occidental political philosophy for the last three centuries. So long as this doctrine was confined to the superiority of Western over Eastern races, Western nations were able to work on the basis of a division of the Asiatic and African continents among themselves. The Nazis, however, carried this idea a step further and began to preach and then to practise the doctrine of the superiority of their own race as against all other races whether Western or Eastern and it was only then that the philosophy of race superiority began to shock and horrify the rest of Europe.

Looking at it in its proper perspective, the Nazi ideology is the logical outcome of the doctrine of race superiority as believed in and practised by the Western Nations during the last three centuries. From this we must draw the lesson that so long as our standards of right conduct are only comparative and not absolute, they are bound in the long run to lead to conflict and engender a vast amount of human misery. We must, therefore, take care that the standards that we set ourselves in the making of the peace and the ordering of the postwar world shall stand the test of absolute and not merely of comparative merit. We must be fair, just and humane to the uttermost, whatever sacrifices that might involve rather than merely fair, just and humane as compared with another nation or another age.

From our first postulate, therefore, it follows that the

right of self-determination must be accorded to every nation after the war and the doctrine of the dominance of one race or nation over another race or nation must be definitely discarded and buried out of sight. Certain areas and peoples may have to be specially treated and cared for before they are in a position to be able to enjoy the full benefit of self-determination. Our attitude towards these should be determined by the admission which we must freely make even to ourselves, that the present plight of these areas and peoples is due to our neglect and our failure in the past to discharge adequately our responsibilities towards them. That being so, we must now make such amends as the situation in each area might call for and should set ourselves the task of seeing that these areas and peoples are brought into line with the rest of humanity as quickly as possible. Any special arrangements or treatment that may be necessary in the case of these areas should not be made the excuse for prolonging the domination of any one nation or group of nations over these areas.

As another corollary from our first fundamental principle, I would go on to stress that in our post-war arrangements, there should be no exploitation of one nation by another. Political domination has not in the past been the only means of exploitation. Treaties and engagements which on the face of them have borne a commercial color have often been imposed by one nation on another with a view to exploitation and have in many instances brought political domination in their wake.

We must recognize the great truth that Providence has not been niggardly towards any nation nor indeed

towards the human race as a whole. If each nation were to devote its efforts to the development of its own resources and every one of them were to conform to a system which would ensure a fair distribution and exchange of commodities, materials and goods between different nations and different sections of each nation, we would find not only that there was enough for everybody but that all of us could enjoy a reasonable fullness of all that makes human life attractive and worthwhile.

It is not by robbing our neighbors but by freely giving and sharing that we can promote plenty both for ourselves and for our neighbors. This is a principle, the working of which will be found to be as beneficent among nations as among individuals. The more nations there are that are kept in economic servitude by other nations, the poorer will mankind be; the more each nation is prosperous, the richer all of us would be. One would have imagined that this was a self-evident truth and good economic policy and yet, in the past, each nation has striven to enrich itself at the expense of some other nation, forgetting that by that process, we were all rendering ourselves much the poorer.

After the war, there will be a great deal of apparently surplus machinery and skill which during the war years is being devoted to the manufacture of weapons of destruction. Let the United Nations resolve so to distribute this surplus in different parts of the earth after the war as to ensure the maximum of beneficent yield from it in the post-war years. Let this be a free gift from the United Nations to mankind and we shall find that it will act like "bread cast upon the waters" and will be returned to all of us a hundred-fold. Our past tendency

to regard the resources of the earth as limited and, therefore, available only in certain proportions to each nation, resulted from the application of our own puny and miserly measures to the benevolence of Providence. Let us now make up our minds to cultivate individually and as nations the attributes of Providence in ourselves and to act with complete benevolence towards our fellow beings; thereby shall we not only contribute very largely towards the happiness of humanity but shall ensure our own individual and national happiness too.

We must make a real effort to get away from every economic form of "ism," as our allegiance to different patterns of economic "isms" has already wrought great injury and engendered jealousy and hatred between different classes and sections. We must realize that our interests are common and not antagonistic and our efforts should be directed towards co-operation rather than exploitation. True it is that capital and labor both contribute towards the production of wealth and must, therefore, receive their due share of that wealth; but have we not in the past forgotten that all ultimate sources of wealth, namely the earth and all its treasures, the sun, the moon, the stars and the heavens, the winds that blow, the clouds that bring rain, etc., are the free gifts of Providence to the whole of mankind? While distributing produced wealth among labor and capital, we must not forget the share that humanity as such is entitled to on account of the contribution that Providence has made towards the production of all wealth on behalf of the whole of humanity.

We must, therefore, devise some system by which a portion of all wealth that is produced is returned to the

community as a whole and is devoted towards the provision of the minimum necessary comforts and amenities for every individual member of the community. With private ownership as such, I have no quarrel. Indeed, I personally consider that private ownership of property is an institution, the safe-guarding of which is necessary to preserve that incentive towards the development of individual faculties, talents and resources without which the community would be very much the poorer; but while recognizing the necessity of private ownership, I would subject all capital as well as income to certain levies which would ensure the return to the community as a whole of its due share of the national wealth. The proceeds of these levies would be devoted towards securing a reasonable standard of living to every individual in the community. This would include provision of food, clothing, shelter, warmth, entertainment and facilities for education and instruction. This standard should secure not merely the minimum necessary for the keeping of body and soul together, but such measure of comfort, leisure, entertainment and instruction as would keep alive the soul of the community and maintain the self-respect of every individual. This is neither too high nor impracticable. New Zealand has, in a very large measure, succeeded in securing this standard for the whole of the community and though New Zealand does possess certain advantages, it can surely serve as an object lesson, and what New Zealand has achieved may be achieved by the rest of the world if we will set about it in earnest and with method.

What I would desire to stress particularly in this connection is that efforts towards the raising of standards of

living must proceed in each community from the wealthier sections of the community, not only for the reason that it is only these sections than can make a material contribution towards the desired end, but also for the reason that results achieved in this manner, are likely to promote harmonious relations between different sections of the community to a larger degree than if the same results were achieved through the efforts of those who at present lack those standards. In the latter case, class struggle is bound to be intensified, and whatever the result, each side will be left with a sense of grievance; the poorer sections will feel that they are being kept out of their just dues and the wealthier sections will feel that they are being encroached upon and are being subjected to class blackmail. On the other hand, if the wealthier sections were to charge themselves with the duty of providing reasonable standards for the whole of the community, they would make the sacrifices involved more cheerfully and the poorer sections would have no consciousness of privation. This attitude might well be extended to all human relations, individual as well as national. Where concessions have to be made, they must be made out of a sense of duty or obligation and at a time when they can still be regarded as voluntary. They should neither be niggardly nor delayed so long that they begin to look as if yielded under pressure.

Systems and institutions which have a tendency to concentrate wealth within small circles must be abolished or modified so as to eliminate this tendency. All rules of inheritance like primogeniture which restrict the distribution of a man's property within a very small

circle must be abrogated and rules adopted in their place which secure an equitable distribution among a wide circle of heirs, male as well as female.

Another corrective in the economic field should be the abolition of usury or the lending of money on interest where the borrower is put under an obligation to make a fixed return for the use of the loan to the lender irrespective of what happens to the loan or the purposes towards which it is applied. This is a large subject and is not capable of being treated at any length within the scope of this article. I realize, however, that this is a revolutionary suggestion, and in the absence of a full exposition is likely to invite severe criticism from many directions as being impracticable. Yet, though revolutionary, it is not impracticable. This much might be added, that the abolition of usury does not mean the abolition of commercial partnerships or joint stock companies, for those who participate in such ventures are not only entitled to share in the gain but also accept the risk of loss.

We must also aim at securing reasonable stability in the economic relations between various countries. During the period 1918-1939 currencies and exchanges have been liable to frequent and violent fluctuations resulting in serious damage in the economic sphere. International arrangements designed to secure stability of national currencies and international exchanges should not only be welcome but must be insisted upon as a vital link in the chain of post-war international relationships.

In the social sphere, not only must our efforts be directed towards the raising of the average standards of

living but we must strive to secure the abolition of all privilege based upon race, nationality, caste, color, creed or inheritance. The abolition of titles, honors and other insignia which are the outward badges of distinction and privilege, may accomplish something towards the achievement of this object, but we must be prepared to go a good deal further to promote a real sense of fraternity and equality among the different sections of mankind. Simpler and less ostentatious modes of living voluntarily adopted by the wealthier classes in each community would go a long way towards bridging the gulf which at present separates different sections of society and fostering a sense of brotherhood and equality.

Social intercourse would become much easier and pleasanter if all occasions and causes of embarrassment resulting from disparity in the distribution of wealth were to be eliminated. A good deal might be accomplished in this direction by the adoption of an equitable economic system, but a great deal will still be left to the individual. The most valuable contributions in this sphere will be those which can only be made voluntarily. Each section of the community must make an advance to meet the others on a level of equality and brotherhood. In this sphere as in all others, free and generous giving and sharing rather than individual appropriation will furnish the key to the solution of our problems.

All this and everything else that may be designed towards securing the happiness of mankind would become possible only if security can be guaranteed. Nothing of any permanent value to mankind can have a chance of

establishing itself if the world is to continue to be liable twice in each generation to the kind of conflict in which we are engaged today. It goes without saying that unless the nations are able to establish a workable system of security, there is no hope that mankind will be permitted to occupy themselves with the pursuit of peace, freedom, justice and happiness. This again, is a very large subject in itself and all that can be attempted here is to indicate one or two fundamental principles that must be kept in mind in this connection.

Why did the League of Nations fail in preserving peace? First, because the absence of the United States, admittedly the most powerful nation today, robbed the League of a sense of reality and true responsibility. Secondly, because from the very beginning the impression gained ground, not without some justification, that the League was designed to maintain certain European powers in their position of dominance and pre-eminence, and this made the League suspect among smaller nations.

Each of these factors, no doubt, contributed towards the failure of the League to function successfully and to achieve the ends for which it was set up. For any international security system to work successfully, the United States must be prepared to shoulder its share of responsibility and consequently be prepared to make the sacrifices involved. From those to whom much has been given, much shall be required and they must be prepared to render it. It is also true that in its actual working, the League has tended to endorse the policy of the more powerful European nations. This tendency will be corrected by the application of the doctrines of

race equality and self-determination mentioned in the earlier parts of this article and the participation of the United States in a post-war system of security will tend to restore a balance to the whole arrangement in the West. On the other hand, the emergence of China and India as great free nations and the admission of Soviet Russia into the Comity of Nations will supply the balance in the East.

The real criticism of the League, however, which goes to the root of the matter, is that while it possessed consultative, deliberative and even judicial powers, it was altogether deprived of executive powers; that is to say, the means of carrying its resolutions and judgments into effect. The post-war system of international security must be equipped with this power if it is expected to function at all. Not only must nations be invited to submit their differences to the arbitrament of reason, argument and persuasion, but they must bind themselves to do so and must in the last resort, be compelled to do so. If any of them makes default in carrying out the decision which the international body ultimately arrives at, this body must have at its disposal the forces necessary to compel compliance. Pending the settlement of a difference or dispute while the deliberative processes are functioning, the international body must have the means of curbing aggression and holding it in check, and what is of no less importance, it must be able to act in time; otherwise whatever system or arrangement is set up will fail to inspire confidence and will be foredoomed to failure.

All this assumes that after the war all nations participating in such a system will be willing to forego so

much of their sovereign powers and attributes as may be necessary to ensure the successful working of a system of international security. These powers must then be pooled and placed at the disposal of the international organ.

All devices designed to secure international peace must, however, be applied uniformly to all nations without distinction. It must be realized that every nation is a potential aggressor and so each must be deprived of the power as well as the opportunity of launching forth into actual aggression. Once the adjustments necessitated by the war have been made and the requisite correctives have been applied, Germany, Italy and Japan must be admitted to all international arrangements on the same footing as all other nations. We must not repeat the blunder of perpetuating international jealousies, fears, hatreds, inequalities and injustices, thus starting a new era of international conflicts punctuated by periods of troubled and uneasy respites.

If we are still unable to rise to a full conception of our international duties and responsibilities and are still unprepared to make the necessary sacrifices in the cause of humanity so that mankind may live at peace in a world free from racial, national and sectional dominance and exploitation, we may have to pass through other and more terrible experiences before universal peace and justice can be established.

India and the Peace

By DR. ANUP SINGH, writer and lecturer, the Director of the Research Bureau of India League of America, and Editor of "India Today." He is author of "Nehru: The Rising Star of India" and a member of the Sikh community.

Once again within a generation the tragedy of war has overwhelmed us all. The maimed and the crippled from the last war were still to be seen in the streets of our cities as a frightful warning that it should not happen again, but it has happened again, and on a colossal scale. Innocent men, women and children are being blown to bits in their sleep, and countless others are daily subjected to unspeakable indignities and horrors; the shadow of death, despair and desolation hangs low everywhere. Humanity in anguish cries for deliverance. Will we heed its call this time or betray it again? It is a grim challenge to us all, the peoples of the earth everywhere, but it is also a great opportunity to reshape our destiny. This time it shall not be a peace hatched by diplomats manoeuvring to extract the maximum for their respective nations, but a peace by the people, a peace sustained by the total moral and material resources of us all, for the total welfare of all. We must not fail this time.

What of India? What are the dreams and hopes of her three hundred and ninety millions? Where lie their sympathies in this war? What are some of the crucial problems that beset them, and what are the prospects of their solution? India can join the progressive march of humanity and contribute her share in sustaining a peo-

ple's peace only after a just and equitable solution of the problems that agitate her people has been found.

The people of India are astir as they have seldom been before. There is ever increasing discontent and even bitterness in that ancient land of Buddha. Vast numbers are yet in complete ignorance of the issues that confront our world, but convulsions from the top are pulling even these people from their traditional moorings. This awakened mass of humanity, one fifth of the human race, is destined to play a vital role in the days to come.

The people of India are wholeheartedly with the United Nations in this fight against tyranny and for freedom. They cannot be otherwise. All that Hitler symbolizes and stands for; his cult of hate and violence, his persecution of helpless minorities, his racial arrogance, his paganism, are utterly repugnant to the inner spirit of India's religious millions. Hitlerism is the absolute antithesis and negation of all that India has always stood for. Nor do the people of India fall for the clap-trap of the Japanese slogans of "New Order" and "Asia for the Asiatics." Yes, "Asia for the Asiatics" said the late Tagore, that great seer and poet of India, "but what kind of Asia will emerge from the Japanese barbarities?" asked Tagore. It is a tragic irony that in spite of this identity of ultimate ideals and purposes between India and the United Nations, the people of India by and large still do not look upon this war as their war. And they must first look upon this war as their war, if they are to view the coming peace as their peace.

India feels a bit skeptical about the professions of the democracies and the promises of their leaders. And

the reason is not far to seek. Dominated by Britain, one of the great leaders of democracies, she cannot feel enthusiasm for the slogans of today and the promises of tomorrow. This domination must end, for this war to become the people's war in India, and as one being fought for the people's peace. Whatever may have been the case in the past, when Indians either acquiesced in British rule or actively supported it, today this rule is rejected and resented by the overwhelming mass of the people. Today this rule functions not with the consent of the governed, but against their wishes. This unhealthy atmosphere must end before the energies of India's embittered masses can be released. It is no longer enough to point to the progress toward freedom that has already been made in India, or to cite the balance of trade in favor of India, or the number of jobs Indians hold in the civil service. Much progress has been made, but it is not enough because it does not satisfy the Indians today. They point out the fact, that the ultimate seat of power still remains in London, that the Viceroy can still declare India belligerent without consulting any Indian, that thousands of Indians can still be held in prison without trial. It is not enough even to cite India's disunity as a bar against freedom. For to the Indian, the alien domination itself is a bar against unity. Nor is it enough to point out that Britain, through the Cripps mission, has already promised India complete freedom, after the war. Indians do not think so. Their faith can be inspired only by a daring move made now, a measure of freedom now, consistent with the political aspirations of India and the military needs of the United Nations.

Further, India must set her own house in order before her people will be able to make their due contribution to the people's peace. Her institutions that once served her purposes admirably need recasting. There are the problems of the caste system, the Hindu-Moslem relationship, the Princes and the Pariahs; the problems of crushing poverty and of appalling illiteracy.

The caste system, originally based upon the respective aptitudes of individuals, served India by reducing friction among groups that accepted their status ungrudgingly, each making its contribution to the well-being of society. It has outlived its usefulness. It has since gathered round it supercilious distinctions and taboos and prejudices. It has deteriorated and become fossilized. Its deadly hand falls most cruelly upon the Untouchables who have been consigned to an utterly degrading status. Reformers like Gandhi have already taken up the challenge to redeem the lot of these underdogs. Education, industrialism and exposure to the world will in time do the rest.

The Hindu-Moslem problem is today a canker in the Indian body politic. For the better part of a thousand years the Hindus and the Moslems have lived together side by side, and together they have created the India of today. They are of the same race, speak the same language, have a common past and a common future. Politics has temporarily poisoned their relationship in the cities, while over ninety per cent of the masses, Hindu and Moslem, still live amicably in the countless tiny villages of India.

The new political awakening in India while creating political unity also created a sense of exclusive com-

munity feeling. The system of voting based on religion has been playing havoc with Indian politics. Recent demand by a faction of the Moslems for partition of India along religious lines has been gaining ground. Such partition is neither feasible nor desirable. The Indian National Congress stands for India's unity and freedom and is committed to the protection of the rights of all the minorities, through all conceivable guarantees. It is hoped that once the fury and tempest of today subsides, the groups will adjust their claims and counter-claims on a rational basis.

The Princes of India represent a medieval past that will have to be shaken off before the people can come to their own. With a few notable exceptions the bejeweled Rajas are autocrats without social conscience. Not the welfare of their wards, but "conspicuous waste," games and pageantry have often filled their days. They are not in the best tradition of India's ancient kings, whose first concern was the happiness and welfare of their subjects. That is why most of the ninety million subjects of today's Princes are unhappy. They too are demanding a voice in their affairs, and nothing can muzzle them much longer—neither the wrath of their rulers nor the protection accorded the latter by Britain in the name of antiquated treaties. Only those who reform in time, and see the handwriting on the wall will hold, the others will go as their kind has always gone.

Poverty is India's greatest curse. It has no excuse to exist in a land of vast potential riches and resources. Over eighty per cent of the people do not know what it is to have a square meal from one end of the year to the other. Hunger haunts them from the cradle to the

grave. It is written large on their faces. Millions of undernourished infants die every year. Families of twelve and thirteen are herded in dingy unventilated single rooms in the large cities. Twenty-seven years is the average span of life in India. India's industrial progress has been held in check and thwarted. The need for manufactured materials in the last war and again now has given industry new impetus; but there is, as yet, no vision, no plan or program to lift the curse of poverty. That is the problem, first and foremost, for the people of India. For these famished and the starved, peace would have no meaning if it did not bring food for their hungry mouths.

Mass education is another of India's dire needs. Only eight per cent of the males and around four per cent of the females can read or write any language. How can it be otherwise when only five per cent of the national budget is spent on education, and when over vast areas, education is neither compulsory nor free? People are free to remain ignorant. India's own indigenous system that in the past transmitted the cultural heritage from generation to generation, through village symposiums and religious festivals, has broken down, and the new has remained haphazard and inadequate. India must have rapid education on a vast scale, or else her people will find themselves utterly helpless in the world of tomorrow.

The Indian National Congress has worked out elaborate plans for the political and social regeneration of India's masses, and, given the chance, it intends to put them in effect at the very first opportunity.

According to this plan:

1. Every citizen of India has the right of free expression of opinion, the right of free association and combination, and the right to assemble peacefully and without arms, for purposes not opposed to law or morality.

2. Every citizen shall enjoy freedom of conscience and the right freely to profess and practise his religion, subject to public order and morality.

3. The culture, language and script of the minorities and of the different linguistic areas shall be protected.

4. All citizens are equal before the law, irrespective of religion, caste, creed or sex.

5. No disability attaches to any citizen, by reason of his or her religion, caste, creed, or sex, in regard to public employment, office of power or honor, and in the exercise of any trade or calling.

6. The State shall observe neutrality in regard to all religions.

7. The franchise shall be on the basis of universal adult suffrage.

8. The State shall provide for free and compulsory primary education.

The National Planning Board sponsored by the Congress has also worked out plans for the economic rehabilitation of India. It envisages:

1. Land Planning
2. Water Planning
3. National Resources Planning
4. Labor
5. Agricultural Planning
6. Industrial Planning
7. Planned Trade
8. Planned Credit
9. Planned Finance: revision of the tax burden in favor of the rural masses.

It concludes with the remark that "although agriculture is and will remain the largest single industry of

this country . . . the economic regeneration of the country cannot take place without industrialization."

India is already in the throes of a "people's revolution." There the old and the new are already in fierce contest. India's immemorial institutions, traditions and customs that survived many a storm and tempest, are called upon now to vindicate themselves in the light of new needs and conditions. In the words of Nehru, it may be that when India puts on her new garment, as she must, for the old is torn and tattered, she will have it cut in this fashion so as to make it conform both to present conditions and her old thought, but the ideas she adopts must be adapted to her native genius.

Will the people of India be able to work out democratic institutions? Democracy in the modern sense is a very recent thing even in the West. But the popular notion that the Orient has always known and endured autocracy and tyranny is utterly untenable. The Indian villages have known throughout the ages the Panchayat system, where the five elders of the community dispense justice and run the local affairs. India has known tyrants, but the divine right of kings was never accepted in India. In theory, at least, the ruler was always expected to abide by the sacred laws laid down in the scriptures. Again, the popular notion that the fatalistic masses of India always suffered in silence, and never revolted, is untenable. Over and over again, they have revolted, whenever the limit of their patience was reached. They never tolerated any encroachment upon their religious and social customs. Real democracy has less of a chance among people who can deify a State, Party, or a Führer, but not among the people of India,

whose ultimate allegiance is always to the Creator of the Universe. A small minority of educated Indians have imbibed the new ideas of political democracy, and these ideas will in time filter through to the masses. The people are tolerant, law-abiding and peaceful, which would help in sustaining representative institutions. There is already a vast network of administrative machinery, that has knit the whole country, where successful beginnings of representative institutions have been made. Democracy is facing an uphill fight everywhere. In India, too, it will pass through serious trials. India in her political struggle has produced leaders wedded to the democratic principle, men of noble character and great social vision. In their hands India's destiny is safe.

For the first time in history we of the East and West are face to face with each other, and with common problems. From across the oceans we have joined hands and are comrades in arms, and we will have to remain comrades in peace. There is no turning back now, only marching forward triumphantly, building a sane world fit for civilized men and women of all races to live in, in peace and harmony. This new world can be created only by the joint endeavors of all the people of all the universe.

The kind of world that would satisfy India's millions is a world in which India as a nation is as free as any other nation; a world in which racial discrimination against her children will be a thing of the past; a world in which her famished millions will have food and shelter and education. To the galaxy of nations in such a world India will bring her great gift of universality, her

spiritual idealism, her mellowed wisdom, and she will be ready to receive the great gifts of all other nations.

The people of India have never sought power and glory and prestige. Their ancient prayer, recited even today by millions is: "Lead me from the unreal to the real, lead me from darkness to light, lead me from death to immortality."

JUGOSLAVIA

Eastern Europe Awaits a Common Man's Peace

By SAVA N. KOSANOVICH, *former Minister of State.*

This war is not a war of soldiers on the front only, but of the people as a whole. All the energies of the people—military, economic, social and moral—are involved in it. History has never seen a conflict similar to this war in totality of the national effort. When we recall how history was taught in our schools a few decades ago, we remember that it consisted mostly of wars between Kings: "That and that King declared war on that and that King or concluded peace or captured or killed some King." It was the same story throughout the ages. There was no doubt a great deal of exaggeration and oversimplification in this explanation of the causes of wars but also a good deal of truth in the emphasis placed on the role of Kings, for wars were fought by soldiers—one warrior against another—while the masses of the people were largely unaffected and often indifferent to the outcome of the war. The present war involves all social strata, horizontally and vertically. The nations of the world are broken up into fronts, and behind the military front an ideological war is being fought even in the most powerful countries. All values have been turned upside down. Through

brutal exploitation, poverty has been made universal in a large part of the world. For that reason, the peace which will follow this war must be different from the peace treaties which marked the end of previous wars. Instead of diplomatic agreements, full of traditional formalities, etiquette and ancient rituals, often far removed from the life they were supposed to regulate, the peace after this war must be, like the war itself, peace for the common man, which will enable as large a proportion of the world as possible to live better and in greater harmony than before. The peace which will follow this war cannot be a peace of the patrons of the past. It must be the peace, like the war: people's war, people's peace.

The material and moral sacrifices are so enormous and dreadful that we must already start thinking how to provide an adequate cure for the wounded organism of mankind. If that is not done, our civilization will march directly to its catastrophe. The task is immensely difficult. An end must be put to the era of insecurity and uncertainty, and an era of rest and rehabilitation must be inaugurated, especially for the countries which remain alive after surviving the most frightful disease in their history. Everything must be done to create a mechanism for the prevention of wars and to make impossible, through the collective will of the healthy nations, the reappearance of the disease which Nazism represents in our civilization. The Commonwealth of Nations can accomplish this by collective action, only if it has a moral right to do so, if it commits no mistakes and tolerates no injustices which would deprive it of that right.

Hitler and Mussolini claimed that their countries had to go to war because they were impoverished by the exploitation of the "rich countries." The thesis that the Treaty of Versailles had reduced the standard of living of the German people below the subsistence level was so systematically and effectively circulated in the course of two decades that authoritative circles in many countries became convinced that the German claim was true. As a result, one German obligation after another was liquidated, and Germany was relieved of the burden imposed upon her for the sins committed against humanity during the first World War which was a prelude to the present conflict. Although that propaganda was devoid of any factual basis, it succeeded in mystifying the world, especially the wealthy classes. And even today in the midst of a new war, incomparably more horrible than the last, we hear explanations in America that the cause of the war is impoverishment of Germany by the Treaty of Versailles. But whom did Germany and Italy attack? Whose lands have they devastated? Lands richer or poorer than themselves? Ethiopia, Poland, Greece, Yugoslavia and, then Russia. The average standard of living in these countries can scarcely be compared with that of Germany. "Exploited" Germany received a carload of wheat from Yugoslavia in exchange for a typewriter, while most of the people of Yugoslavia lived on corn-bread. American capital entered Germany in large amounts in order to place that country on a sound economic basis, and Germany reinvested that same capital in the area of its *Lebensraum* in order to tie it to herself economically, exploit it and, finally, strangle it by

military occupation. That policy was justified not only on economic but also on humanitarian grounds. The world was extremely charitable toward the Germans and preferred to find an excuse for all their sins. For that reason, the nations of Central and Eastern Europe were left to the mercy of Germany to do with them what she liked. While France followed a policy of military and political co-operation with the countries of Central and Eastern Europe, at the same time Germany was being economically strengthened and the countries of Central and Eastern Europe were allowed to become more and more dependent on the German Reich. In the meantime, Germany was spending billions on armaments, for a new war, for a new catastrophe of mankind. What a paradox! An impoverished nation, exhausted by victorious exploiters, instead of producing butter, builds guns which in the fourth year of the war the combined power of the United States, Great Britain and Soviet Russia has not been able to destroy! The standard of living in Germany was not reduced by these enormous war expenditures as was the case in Russia which did not have the support of Western capital. Amply financed by her "creditors," Germany was able to develop her industries, open new markets and expand the area available for economic exploitation and make the industrially undeveloped countries more and more economically dependent upon her. At the same time, Germany prepared for war, created a tremendous military machine and started the war at the moment which in her opinion offered the greatest chance of success. No one attacked Germany. She attacked Austria, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Yugoslavia and, finally, Russia.

Italy did the same: Ethiopia, Spain, Albania, Greece, and France.

What is the impelling motive or idea of these aggressions? War against political democracy and against communism. What has been the result of this war? Destruction of civilization in the very cradle of civilization. German living space has been temporarily broadened to include almost all of Europe, and in that space we can see the face of the "new order." The Axis, in the first place Germany, is the exploiter of all the nations of Europe and the standard of living in all European countries has been reduced below the level prevailing before the war. For the peoples of Eastern Europe that means death from hunger. Without referring to direct physical extermination of men, women and children in the occupied countries by mass murders and deportations, and to the reduction of 100,000,000 inhabitants to the level of misery, the road which must not be followed in the future is clear.

The nations of Eastern Europe, especially the Jugoslavs, Czechoslovaks and Poles, have shared the same tragic fate of standing in the way of German imperialism through centuries. In this struggle, Germany had the advantage of superior strength and as a rule the support of the other Great Powers. The nations of Eastern Europe in peacetime and wartime belonged to the sphere of German exploitation which during the past twenty-four years became more and more refined in its cruelty. The weak nations were materially and politically abused and finally occupied by force of arms.

It is fortunate, indeed, that the invaders have not been able to destroy the morale of the occupied nations.

Fortunately for all of mankind, the moral strength of all these peoples has exceeded all expectations. While being impoverished, pushed to the level of starvation, they were splendidly defending the general cause of humanity. Can it happen that the peace which will follow will be a peace which will permit the citizens of Germany, who have been the missionaries of exploitation practised by their regime from Dunkirk to Moscow and from Narvik to Crete, not only to maintain their standard of living which they obtained solely through exploitation, but also to increase it as a reward for this latest aggression against humanity, while the citizens of the small and devastated countries who are fighting for a just order in the world will be left at their present level of destitution from which they have not been permitted to rise in spite of all their efforts and the rich natural resources of the territories which they inhabit?

No, that sort of peace is impossible. In line with the ideals of Roosevelt and Wallace, this war must end in peace for the common man. That means that the countries of Eastern Europe and the Balkans cannot and must no longer be regarded as "inferior" to the rest of Europe. Freed from exploitation this part of Europe will also become largely free from need. Victory of the United Nations must eliminate exploitation in any form—on the part of enemies as well as on the part of "friends." The new world order must make impossible payment of enormous unearned dividends of foreign capital, while domestic labor goes hungry. For example, one of the best copper mines in Europe, Bor in Yugoslavia, paid annual dividends of 235% to its French

owners, while the workers in that mine and in most of Yugoslavia received only *twenty-five cents a day* in wages. Exploitation of agrarian countries, where the possibilities for capital accumulation are small, by highly developed industrial nations must not be permitted to continue. The argument that Germany's exploitation of Eastern Europe was automatically corrected by the competition of the other industrial nations is not true, for that competition was prevented by international cartels. For example, Yugoslav cement was 100% cheaper abroad than in Yugoslavia, which produced it. Artificial fertilizer was not produced in a typically agrarian country like Yugoslavia, because the foreign company which owned the concession did not wish to compete with its factories in French North Africa. In addition, capital was protected by a tariff which guaranteed it maximum possible yields. This was done on the theory that it was necessary to protect "national infant industries."

Without great investments and unusual efforts, most of the problems can be solved, once the common man obtains one pint of milk a day, in the words of Mr. Wallace, or half a pint of milk a day, in the words of Madame Litvinoff. When through collective security freedom from fear is guaranteed to the weaker nations, mankind will enter an era of progress the like of which the world has not seen. Peace of that kind will justify the sacrifices which are being made today and the blood which is being shed. To obtain peace of that kind, we can demand new sacrifices as well as abandonment of aggressive chauvinism, excessive desires for economic self-sufficiency and absolute state sovereignty.

Frontiers among the states must facilitate and simplify the problem of administration. They must not complicate and discourage union and harmony. Nationalism must not be inflamed by oppression. In complete freedom, the feeling of nationalism will lose its aggressive characteristics, while the world will retain the beauty of a mosaic. Similarly religion must be free, but it must be completely separated from state power in order to avoid the mistakes and abuses which so often occurred in the past.

The nations of Eastern Europe and the Balkans can find a common solution for many of their problems. The peasant masses from the Balkans to the Baltic may be looked upon as a unit. Their relationship to industry is the same; their pre-war standard of living was practically the same; and their mentality is almost identical. But there are certain important differences in the economic and social structure of these countries which must be eliminated. For example, Yugoslavia carried out in 1918 a radical agrarian reform, but it was not carried out in Hungary, Rumania and Poland. In these countries, landed estates of thousands of acres were left untouched. If we are to look at this entire region as one unit, this situation is intolerable. There are other similar problems. As I said before, highly industrialized countries must be deprived of their privileged position, for the relationship between them and the undeveloped countries is the same as that between the large aristocratic estates and the small peasant landowners or agricultural workers owning no land.

For the sake of a greater commonwealth of nations, in which he will feel secure as an individual and as

member of a nation, the common man of Eastern Europe is ready today to support a realization of the principles I have here outlined. The territory between the Baltic, the Adriatic and the Aegean Seas should be a bridge between the soviet Union and Western democracies. Living on the crossroads between the East and the West, the inhabitants of this territory understand Russia and they understand the West. That area must be the link which will connect Soviet Russia with the great nations of the West. It must not be made into a buffer state between Russia and the West. If an attempt were made to impose such a solution upon the nations of that territory, they would reject it, for it would mean that in the near future their countries would again become new theatres of war and victims of new conflicts. The Jugoslavs, Czechoslovaks, Poles and Greeks have suffered enough and they have shown more than enough moral strength in making sacrifices not only for their existence, but also for the ideals of humanity, not to deserve such a fate. These are the peoples of the common man and they deserve a common man's peace!

.

MEXICO

Mexico and Pan Americanism *

By EZEQUIEL PADILLA, *Secretary of Foreign Affairs of Mexico.*

If we can, united together, begin to live a truly Pan American life, how great a wealth of blessings will be showered upon the Americas! If we proclaim the Pan American doctrine, without falling into the grave responsibility of leaving it to unilateral initiative, because it is a doctrine that calls for action by all of us; if we pool our potential resources, together with the technics, the capital and the initiative that we have available throughout our Continent; if we can bequeath to our children, as a legacy, those splendid words that say that if any one of our countries is attacked by a nation outside this Continent, all the nations will rise up, not merely one nor two, but the whole of America, to repel the invader just as though the outrage upon its sovereignty had been inflicted on its own flesh! Lastly, if we win the right to occupy seats at the council table of peace, what an enormous service we shall be able to render our Americas, by upholding a platform of na-

* From the address delivered by Ezequiel Padilla, Secretary of Foreign Affairs of Mexico, at the opening meeting of Consultation of the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the American Republics in Rio de Janeiro, January 15, 1942.

tional and international justice, for only from it may peace permanent and enduring flow!

Twenty-five years ago the victory of the Allies led us to believe that peace would last for ages. A single generation, however, has been sufficient to let loose another war, even more cruel and destructive, to scourge humanity. What was lacking was organized justice between the peoples. And when a single iniquity is left standing, it is even as the stone in David's sling, or a fiery torch in the hand of hatred and despair!

We must, on this Continent, build up a world that shall be fairer to all, we must here work out a platform that shall mean justice to all. Iniquity still existent on vast areas of these Americas gnaws the very heart of the laboring masses.

If we can thus succeed in organizing not only an economic system but also in creating an American moral entity, we shall thus be able to show by means of our deliberations that what interests us is not only the building of shipyards and the construction of airplanes, of such enormous value in war, but also that there is something higher that we are anxious to build up—freedom for man in the Americas!

We have need of such things as cadmium, molybdenum, and other strategic material for war, but there is one other product that we must not overlook: free man in America, on whose brow shall shine the dignity of his manhood; man the consumer, the soldier, the custodian of liberty!

We must efface the very last stain of slavery on this American Continent. Just as we must tear down the opprobrious gates of the Guiana prisons, for to this Con-

continent only men who seek liberty may come. In the same manner we must do away with economic servitude by promoting production free from slave competition in other regions of the earth!

If we can succeed by our own production in bestowing an existence measuring up to the standards set by the dignity of man, on the workers of the Americas; if what we advocate is not self-sufficiency, but only that in commercial interchange, such products be sold only to nations where salaries worthy of men and not starvation wages prevail; if we can, by means of the exchange of our wealth and work, uplift and dignify the life of man in the Americas, then, how grand would this Pan American Union become, how ethically magnificent, how crystal clear, how strong, to win the support of all the masses of the Americas!

The peoples of the Americas listen to the voice of democracy and hear us when we summon them to the defense of the American spirit. But we may not disregard the fact that the peoples of the Americas are still clamoring for justice; we must reflect that totalitarian philosophy is exploiting the pain of the multitudes, to instil into them a mystical force that gives them strength, that turns them into fanatics, that leads them to sacrifice!

If we, in turn, by our decisions, by our clear vision of the future, by our resolution to build up mighty American nations, should yet fail to create a doctrine, a faith, a hope, that will make the youth of the Americas feel proud to live for, they will not, either, be ready to die in their defense!

Arduous is the task that lies before us, but the atmos-

phere and the omens are favorable. There is unity in all of us. We all realize that we are face to face with destiny. This is a rendezvous in history that we may not fail to keep.

Mexico is a peace-loving country. "Respect for the right of others is peace," said Juárez, endorsing our action in the lawful defense of our sovereignty; but Mexico, like all the other nations of the Americas, above all things craves the victory of human liberties. I deem this moment both solemn and propitious to declare that Mexico will, with the same energy, the same courage with which she has marched to sacrifice, to the struggle, often in the teeth of adversity and in unequal fight, to defend the principles of her sovereignty and her dream of social justice, Mexico will on this occasion step forward, full of conviction and devoted to the cause of democracy and the unity of the American peoples!

THE NETHERLANDS

Towards a Netherlands Commonwealth *

By H. M. QUEEN WILHELMINA

Today it is a year ago that the Japanese, without previous declaration of war, launched their treacherous attack on our Allies. At that time we did not hesitate for a moment to throw ourselves into the struggle and to hasten to the aid of our Allies, whose cause is ours.

Japan had been preparing for this war and for the conquest of the Netherlands Indies for years and in so doing sought to follow the conduct of its Axis partners in attacking one country after another. This plan we were able to prevent, thanks to our immediate declaration of war.

After a year of war we can bear witness that the tide is turning and that the attacker, who had such great advantages, is being forced on the defensive.

It is true that the Netherlands Indies, after defending themselves so heroically, are, for the most part, occupied by the enemy, but this phase of the struggle is only a prelude. The Japanese are getting ever nearer the limit of their possibilities as our ever-growing might advances towards them from all sides.

They have not been able to break China's courage

* The radio address delivered by H. M. Queen Wilhelmina on December 6th, 1942 from London.

and endurance and Japan now faces the ebbing of her power in this self-willed war, which will end with her complete downfall.

At this moment my thoughts are more than ever with my country and my compatriots in the Netherlands and the Netherlands Indies.

After an age-old historical solidarity, in which had long since passed the era of colonial relationship, we stood on the eve of a collaboration on a basis of equality when suddenly we were both confronted by the present ordeal.

The treacherous aggression on the Netherlands in 1940 was the first interruption in the process of development; the heroic battle of the Netherlands Indies, followed by the occupation of the major part of this territory in 1942, was the second.

At the time when the Indies were still free and only Holland was occupied, the vigor of our unity became apparent and on both sides a feeling of stronger kinship developed more rapidly than it could have in peacetime. Now, however, this mutual understanding has been deepened still further because the same struggle is shared in all its agony and the same distress is suffered in all its bitterness.

In the Netherlands as well as in the Netherlands Indies the enemy, with his propaganda for the so-called new order, has left nothing untried to lure the spirit of the people and to disguise his tyranny and suppression with the lies of his promises for the future. But these lies and this deceit have been of no avail because nearly all have seen through them and have understood that our enemies have as their aim nothing but slavery and

exploitation and that as long as they have not been driven out and defeated there can be no question of freedom.

In previous addresses I announced that it is my intention, after the liberation, to create the occasion for a joint consultation about the structure of the Kingdom and its parts in order to adapt it to the changed circumstances.

The conference of the entire Kingdom which will be convoked for this purpose, has been further outlined in a Government declaration of January 27th, 1942. The preparation of this conference, in which prominent representatives of the three overseas parts of the Kingdom will be united with those of the Netherlands at a round table, had already been begun in the Netherlands Indies, Surinam and Curaçao, the parts of the Kingdom which then still enjoyed their freedom.

Especially in the Netherlands Indies, detailed material had been collected for this purpose and it was transmitted to me in December, 1941 by the Governor General. The battle of the Netherlands Indies disrupted these promising preparations.

We can only resume these preparations when everyone will be able to speak his mind freely.

Although it is beyond doubt that a political reconstruction of the Kingdom as a whole and of the Netherlands and the overseas territories as its parts is a natural evolution, it would be neither right nor possible to define its precise form at this moment.

I realize that much which is great and good is growing in the Netherlands despite the pressure of the

occupation; I know that this is the case in the Indies where our unity is fortified by common suffering.

These developing ideas can only be shaped in free consultation in which both parts of the Kingdom will want to take cognizance of each other's opinions.

Moreover, the population of the Netherlands and of the Netherlands Indies has confirmed through its suffering and its resistance, its right to participate in the decision regarding the form of our responsibility as a nation towards the world and of the various groups of the population towards themselves and one another.

By working out these matters now, that right would be neglected, and the insight which my people have obtained through bitter experience, would be disregarded.

I am convinced, and history as well as reports from the occupied territories confirm me in this, that after the war it will be possible to reconstruct the Kingdom on the solid foundation of complete partnership, which will mean the consummation of all that has been developed in the past.

I know that no political unity nor national cohesion can continue to exist which are not supported by the voluntary acceptance and the faith of the great majority of the citizenry.

I know that the Netherlands more than ever feel their responsibility for the vigorous growth of the Overseas Territories and that the Indonesians recognize, in the ever-increasing collaboration, the best guarantee for the recovery of their peace and happiness.

The war years have proved that both peoples possess the will and the ability for harmonious and voluntary co-operation.

A political unity which rests on this foundation moves far towards a realization of the purpose for which the United Nations are fighting, as it has been embodied, for instance, in the Atlantic Charter, and with which we could instantly agree, because it contains our own conception of freedom and justice for which we have sacrificed blood and possessions in the course of our history.

I visualize, without anticipating the recommendations of the future conference, that they will be directed towards a commonwealth in which the Netherlands, Indonesia, Surinam and Curaçao will participate, with complete self-reliance and freedom of conduct for each part regarding its internal affairs, but with the readiness to render mutual assistance.

It is my opinion that such a combination of independence and collaboration can give the Kingdom and its parts the strength to carry fully their responsibility, both internally and externally.

This would leave no room for discrimination according to race or nationality; only the ability of the individual citizens and the needs of the various groups of the population will determine the policy of the government.

In the Indies, as in the Netherlands, there now rules an oppressor who, imitating his detestable associates and repudiating principles which he himself has recognized in the past, interns peaceful citizens and deprives women and children of their livelihood.

He has uprooted and dislocated that beautiful and tranquil country; his new order brings nothing but misery and want.

Nevertheless, we can aver that he has not succeeded in subjugating us, and as the ever-growing force of the United Nations advances upon him from every direction, we know that he will not succeed in the future.

The Netherlands Indies and the Netherlands with their fighting men on land, at sea and in the air, with their alert and brave merchantmen and by their dogged and never-failing resistance in the hard struggle, will see their self-sacrifice and intrepidity crowned after the common victory with the recovery of peace and happiness for their country and their people in a new world.

In that regained freedom they will be able to build a new and better future.

The Road Towards the Four Freedoms

By PIETER S. GERBRANDY, *Prime Minister*

A cynic once said that experience is nothing but the repetition of the same mistakes. If this epigram were true post-war reconstruction would be a futile and a tragic undertaking. For it is clear that if we are to have any hopes of building a better world we must learn from our mistakes rather than repeat them. The lessons are clear enough, especially those lessons the world has so dearly bought with the great experiment of the League of Nations. As long as it was possible, the Netherlands—far from standing aloof as an indifferent neutral as is sometimes erroneously thought—supported the experiment fully and unreservedly. They were with the

League word and deed, and within the League one cannot speak of neutrality. But as time went on the great powers followed a policy more and more outside the League—one of the things rendering the covenant virtually worthless—the Netherlands had to find a different path to follow. I am of the opinion that the Rhineland occupation offered the last opportunity of putting collective security into practice.

When this opportunity was allowed to go by default, there was no other possibility for a country like the Netherlands than to return to the policy of neutrality. This does not mean that the Netherlands were not aware of the deadly threat against mankind and human life of Nazism. From the beginning the vast majority was spiritually on the side of the Allies. But there was no basis on which this could have been translated into an effective international agreement, because there was a lack of preparation and collective machinery on the side of the non-Nazi powers. The only existing path, that of the Covenant of the League of Nations, had been neglected. Another could not be improvised.

So much for the past. What lessons can we draw from this experience for the future? If something in the nature of the League of Nations has to be set up again—and I am convinced that this will have to be done—we must choose between the principle of universality and the principle of likemindedness. I choose the latter. Collaboration as conceived by the League is not possible between nations one of which has some understanding of the partnership of might and law, while the other in word and deed glorifies might as a leading principle in the field of international relations.

We have to be modest and realistic. Collaboration in the spirit I have indicated aims at solving quarrels between States in the sphere of growing international law. This is only partly possible. The vast political problems and interests of great powers cannot, at least certainly not yet, be brought within the limits of this growing international law. And in so far as it is possible for the lesser ones, we have to realize that ultimately the choice is not between war and peace, but between arbitrary war and war as a regulated international instrument.

We shall definitely need to take police measures against the aggressor nations. Perhaps the most obvious of these will be the concentration of aircraft in the hands of the board of the collaborating democratic peoples combined with control of aircraft in the defeated countries.

If there is to be a grouping of interests in any future co-operative system, it will be asked, of course, who should be associated on the basis of common needs and interests? This question may be answered along these lines. In the coming relations between peoples the urge to prevent aggression, on the one hand, will act with far greater strength than in the years which followed the last war. On the other hand, the lessons of the past will have strengthened the conviction that in the co-operation among peoples one should not overreach oneself. The regulation of future relations between these two poles points in the direction that the Netherlands Kingdom, which is neither an ordinary small state nor a powerful state—such as the British Empire or the United States—will with singleness of purpose seek to link up—and find a response for it—those states whose historic

and political principles and interests in the international sphere are akin to its own.

A State is not a geographical conception but above all a historic-political unit. Real collaboration can be expected only between those States which have a historic-political similarity. For four centuries the kingdom of the Netherlands has been scattered over four continents, and the interests it defends are world-wide. It is closely knit and its constituent parts cannot be considered separately. Therefore, we would have no use for an unreal conception such as a purely European grouping of nations, a United States of Europe. Nor can there be any question of neutrality as far as the Netherlands are concerned. I hold the opinion that neutrality will be made an atavism in the future framework.

I hope that collaboration in this war will reveal a useful political similarity between most of the present Allies. I assent to the proposition that there is a greater community of interest between the Low Countries—and indeed of most coastal States—and Britain, the United States, and other countries overseas, than with a purely European grouping.

In the economic field permit me to turn to the Middle Ages for an analogy—to the times when, centrally by governments, and locally by guilds, trade was controlled and prices of material and labor fixed according to the concept of *justum pretium*.

We have now to revert to some such system, but in a higher and better form. In Holland before the war influences had long been at work, as in many other countries, tending towards the establishment of some kind of planning. Moreover, we, like most of them, had been

forced by the economic policy of other countries to take measures such as the maintenance of domestic agriculture, the fixing of prices in the international market, government subsidies, and so on.

After the war we cannot escape from some sort of additional international planning to prevent wild competition between industries in the supplying of Europe with food and raw materials, especially between the pre-war industries striving to regain their old markets and those industries artificially fostered by the war striving to retain their newly-acquired markets.

There will be three tendencies leading towards planning and away from what one might call the "liberal" economy of pre-war Europe: the tendency arising from the special conditions prevailing in the post-war world; the tendency already working just before the war, due partly to the international political situation, which seemed to require autarchy; the tendency already working in the nineteenth century which I can best summarize in the words *justum pretium*. The first tendency is passing, the second uncertain, and the third permanent and growing.

In the face of these tendencies the problem is how to find a harmonious combination of freedom and initiative with the necessary organization. It is capable of solution.

It is on occasions contended that national planning must harden into economic nationalism, but planning does not necessarily mean State Socialism, nor does it necessarily bring about tension in the whole field of economics. Planning such as I have in mind consists, first and foremost, in developing and enlarging existing

factors. You can but guide and regulate that which flows naturally.

All discussion about future collaboration in the political sphere generally takes for granted many things which are uncertain. There are at work forces which are capable of upsetting apparently very sound plans. The rate of population growth, for instance, has far-reaching consequences. Consider simply the problems presented by the still rapidly growing populations of Russia, Japan, and the Netherlands Kingdom, the declining birthrate in Great Britain, and the stationary population in France.

The actions of men and nations usually have been conceived in the mind long before. What they do is what they have thought earlier. So it was with Nazism and Fascism. Therefore, the system of higher education in a nation is of the utmost importance. The leading principles in education and thought are decisive. When God and His Word are left out of them, collaboration between nations has failed and will continue to fail notwithstanding splendid organization. Justice is so easy to speak of when we gain by it, so difficult when we have to make sacrifices for it.

It is easier to win this overwhelming war than to maintain peace in justice. Every age needs its leading men. We need statesmen more than economists. Much will depend on whether at the critical moment the world can discover statesmen and whether it is ready to use them. And the statesmen must be more than the expression of what is living in his people. He must guide them beyond that, so that when he expresses himself his people will say, "Yes, that is what we feel; that is what we want!"

NEW ZEALAND

A Peace with Security and Adventure

By THE HONORABLE WALTER NASH, *New Zealand Minister to the United States, and Deputy Prime Minister and a member of the War Cabinet in his country.*

If I were asked, "What is the most urgent and vital task facing the United Nations at this moment?", I would answer—and I am certain that free men and women everywhere would answer with me—"It is to break completely the forces of Germany, Japan and Italy on land—at sea and in the air." Everything we have must be staked to win. Should then, the winning of the war be our one and only concern for the present? Or should we, whilst straining every nerve and every muscle for final victory, give thought also as to how we intend to use that victory once we have achieved it? We are making a fatal mistake, I believe, if we look upon these two purposes as separate and distinct—to be pursued independently—first the one and then the other. Rather should they be considered as essentially interdependent—as two phases of the one objective—to be pursued together and with equally firm resolve. Because if we win the war with no plans but a return to normalcy—if we make the mistake that we made last time of leaving the peace to look after itself—then we will assuredly be setting the stage for another war—perhaps within another generation.

We can avoid this if we accept the fact that this war involves a clash of ideas as well as armed forces—that along with victory for our arms we must ensure victory for our ideas over those of the enemy. We must accept the fact that this is a people's war and that we are fighting it to secure a peoples' peace. This obviously means there must be a positive no less than a negative purpose in our war effort.

It means, too, that whether we succeed or fail in our military struggle (and I am confident we shall succeed)—whether or not we emerge from this war into a people's century (and I hope we do)—one thing is quite certain—there can be no return to the world we knew just three short years ago. Any attempt to put the clock back is foredoomed to failure. The world which we knew in 1939 is a world which, for all practical purposes, belongs to antiquity. Those of us who may be reluctant to accept the passing of the old order—who were fortunate enough to enjoy such security and privilege as it bestowed—must remember that it was the order in which Hitler was bred—in which he found a ready audience for the evil doctrines that have now brought anarchy without precedence. Our task for the future, therefore, is not to re-create what has been destroyed but from the ruins which surround us to build new institutions that will enable ordinary men and women everywhere to live better and fuller lives than at any time in the past.

We are engaged, then, in a peoples' war for a peoples' peace—with no very clear goal at the outset, perhaps, except a grim determination to survive in freedom, but with positive post-war aims emerging more and more clearly in the consciousness of the common people who

are fighting it. It is the task of those who are directing our war effort—of leaders of public opinion throughout the nation—to give clarity and emphasis to these aims so that everybody who is working and sacrificing to win the war will know, with complete understanding and conviction, not only what we are fighting *against* but equally what we are fighting *for*. And the first thing that must be clearly understood is that any settlement reached at the end of this war to have any value must ensure—Peace with security and adventure—all are essential, and none can be guaranteed without the others. The peace which follows this war must give people not only the essential though negative advantage of freedom from future war and the threat of war but, in addition, the equally essential and positive advantage of freedom to use their energies to the fullest degree towards a fuller and better life. Unless the peace we build is built on this foundation we are certain to be faced with a situation similar to that which followed the last war with all its mistakes and all its tragedies. The alternatives are a thoroughgoing peace or simply an armistice in which for 10, 20 or 30 years another and even more terrible Armageddon is prepared.

There are hundreds of subjects that will require investigation and innumerable problems for which we will have to find a solution if the pledges we have given are to be honored. To mention only a few there is the problem of wide disparities in living standards both within and between the nations; the problem of ensuring access, on equal terms, to the trade and raw material resources of the world; problems associated with the provision of adequate shipping and other transport

facilities; with the overcoming of racial prejudices and particularly of the idea held by many peoples of their inherent superiority over others; with the breaking down of unreasonable discriminatory migration barriers; with the question of miscegenation; problems of territorial adjustments and the determination of national boundaries; of minority rights and freedom; of the control of colonial territories; of the regulation of international investments and investment policy.

The solution of most of these and the other pressing problems with which the world is confronted today and will be confronted still more critically tomorrow, is I believe, to be found in the answers to the following questions:

(1) Can the resources of the world be so organized as to ensure the availability to all peoples of those commodities and services and that environment which will enable them to develop to the maximum, physically, mentally and culturally?

(2) If it is possible so to organize the world's resources, are the people of the United States, Great Britain and the other United Nations, determined that this tremendous job of organization shall be honestly and courageously attempted?

(3) If the answers to the two preceding questions are in the affirmative then what positive steps are necessary to achieve the objective agreed upon?

This objective is, in effect, the same objective that was so magnificently stated 166 years ago in the American Declaration of Independence. It was stated then, as it has been affirmed since in terms of ideals that are timeless—ideals of liberty, justice, equality and the native rights of man. It fell to the lot of Abraham Lincoln,

almost a century later, to restate these ideals and to give them added emphasis; nearly another century passed and again it fell to the President of the United States—this time President Roosevelt—to restate these eternal principles in terms of his challenging declaration of the Four Freedoms—amplified and strengthened by the pledges of the Atlantic Charter. In this new century that we are now entering, it will be *our* common responsibility—the responsibility of the Governments and the people of all the United Nations, to see that these principles are given full effect to, both nationally and internationally, in our post-war world.

This is a war which is being fought without illusions. The slogans of the last war—"War to End Wars,"—"Homes for Heroes,"—"Hang the Kaiser"—and so on—have not been repeated on this occasion. They could not be. No one would believe them; and there is something both healthy and hopeful in this present lack of illusion on the part of the men on the fighting fronts—on the part of the men and women in the factories and in the homes—on the part of the people generally of the United Nations. We must retain this healthy freedom from illusions when the time comes to build our new world from the ruins of the old. We must see that while we do not go around shouting empty slogans about "wars to end war," we really make this a war that *does* end war. How is this to be done? Two steps I suggest are essential. One is that we must decide on the type of world we want to build—we must have a clear picture of its main features even though we cannot at this stage fill in many of its details. The second is that we must decide now and start to build now the institutions and

the machinery which will be needed to establish the kind of world we want. Hitler gained an enormous advantage by having built up in peacetime a tremendous organization for waging total war. We must in wartime copy his example by preparing the nucleus of an organization with which to build a total peace when the time arrives. We must not assume that once victory is achieved and the fighting stops we will then have peace. We may have an absence of hostilities, but that will not be peace, because peace is something which has to be *BUILT*: it is something which is going to require as much effort—as much determination—as much sacrifice as the war has taken; only by diverting human energy into great constructive activity—as exciting and compelling as the activities of war can a further terrible and bloody conflict be avoided—in another two or three decades.

We who have known the pioneer life in countries like America and New Zealand, know how fully the natural instincts of combat, excitement and comradeship can be satisfied in a struggle against the elements. We know that there is as much satisfaction to be found in such a contest as in any struggle against a human foe. Any man who has worked on—shall we say a great electric power scheme—fighting nature under hard conditions, side by side with other men, and then one day has been able to look down on a mighty dam holding back the waters of a huge, new lake, with a great new Power House down below turning out current which will light homes and cities, drive the machines of factories and bring light and energy to countless parts of the country—any such man knows full well that peace, no less than

war, can be crowded with exciting effort—with heroic achievement—effort and achievement, moreover, which bring no suffering and destruction in their train but a happier and better life for all mankind.

Let us then turn to the two tasks which must be undertaken—deciding on the type of world we want and the nature of the organizations necessary to achieve it. I suggest that we should begin by accepting the Charter signed last year in the Atlantic by President Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill as the foundation principles on which to build. We must aim at giving all people regardless of color, race, or creed, equal access to the world's raw materials and services, so that they may have an equal chance to build up for themselves a full and useful existence.

I do not mean that we should at once hand over to everybody an equal share of the world's physical wealth. What we must do, however, is to give everybody an equal chance to better himself or herself. There must be no exploitation of one group by another or one country by another in the wrong sense of the word.

The acceptance of a world policy of equal rights and opportunity and a frank recognition of the problems to which such acceptance leads are among the imperatives of present day life. Unless we make some progress in evolving this policy and solving these problems within the next generation, then war will visit us again.

One very prevalent attitude as a result of which the progress of the world has been much retarded is the attitude shared by many individuals and many nations of inherent superiority over other individuals or other nations. By this idea of a "superior" people, I do not

merely refer to the absurd excesses of Nazi and Japanese race doctrines and the attitudes these doctrines tend to breed. I refer also to that often unconscious superiority which, in the past, has been typical for example of the attitude of most Western nations towards the people of Asia—of most white peoples towards the colored races. One of the first essentials of post-war reconstruction must be to get rid of this superiority complex.

If there is one thing more certain than another at this period in world history, it is the fact that unless we *do* rid ourselves of the idea that there exists—or can exist—an inherently superior person—superior nation or superior race—we will run into another war within a generation of the conclusion of the present one.

If Western people—whether British, European or American—cannot accept any suggestion of other nations or races being in any respect inherently superior, neither can they expect these other nations or races to look upon the Western peoples as superior to themselves and to accept a secondary position.

There is something wrong with a world in which nations counting their people by the hundred millions, have such low living standards that their progressive development either physically, mentally or culturally, is rendered almost impossible; and yet from whose impoverished resources material tribute is paid to other nations much more fortunately placed and with infinitely higher living standards.

The same principle is involved and a similar injustice committed, when individuals are compelled to work and to exist on low living standards, while any portion of the fruits of their labor benefits other individuals

who, though able to work, live easy, comfortable lives without fear of poverty and lacking neither physical commodities nor personal services.

If this war is a fight for the principles of elementary freedom, we cannot expect those who do the fighting and the working to be satisfied if they find that the freedom they have won is a freedom confined to a few fortunate people or to a few favored nations.

In order to be sure that the freedom we win is a freedom in which *all* will share, we must reorientate the principles that give title to the world's resources and raw materials—to the goods and services which are or can be made available to satisfy human needs.

This I know must be a gradual process. It will impose a heavy responsibility on those countries whose people already enjoy an advanced standard of living because on them will fall the task of trusteeship on behalf of those countries or minority groups who will need guidance and help in their progress towards economic and political development. It will be their task to see that before attempting to better their own living standards when these are already high, the essentials of life are made abundantly available to those less fortunately placed.

I do not, however, suggest that it would be either practicable or wise to lay down now in any specific form the boundaries or the forms of government that are to operate throughout our world of tomorrow. That is a thing which must wait for the day of victory. But we *can* agree *now* on the lines on which those decisions are to be made. And one of the first things which we must in all honesty admit, or we will get nowhere with any

reasonable solution of the problem, is that there cannot be any rigid uniformity in either forms of political and economic structure or methods of Government and administration; nor, in fact, should we attempt to secure anything even approximating uniformity. That does not mean there should not be the same goal for everyone. We must all strive—and we must assist every nation to strive—towards the goal laid down in the Atlantic Charter; but it is obvious that, some countries are far more advanced than others—some will require a *much* greater degree of assistance in money, goods, technical advice and education, than others. But there should be no exploitation of the people themselves or exploitation which greatly diminishes their resources.

The problem, however, simplifies itself considerably if we look closely not at the numbers and divergencies which separate these countries but at the common goal we want them all to march towards. Without committing ourselves at this stage to any detailed scheme of post-war reconstruction we can at least make a start by agreeing on certain basic principles as determining our future policies. I suggest that the ideals implicit in the Atlantic Charter—the freedom and the security for which we are striving—will be realized, and will only be realized, if we are ready here and now to work towards the following objectives:

1. The re-establishment and general observance in the future of the rule of law. This will mean:

- (a) That territory, property and concessions acquired by force must be given up—that troops must be withdrawn from areas where they are illegally operating—that puppet governments must be abolished.

(b) That every government must guarantee the observance of constitutional rights to its citizens—there must be an end to Gestapo rule—to arbitrary arrest and intimidation. A bill of rights must be guaranteed to everyone.

(c) That restraints on its absolute sovereignty must be accepted by every nation, particularly restraints on the right of so-called sovereign states to judge their own controversies and to arm without limit.

2. Acceptance of the principle of equality as between one nation and another and between one person and another irrespective of color, race or creed. This means:

(a) The termination as rapidly as possible of such privileges as extraterritorial jurisdictions, concessions, leaseholds, protectorates, etc., as legacies of the old "imperialist" or "exploitation" idea which can have no place in the modern world of national sentiment and economic interdependence.

(b) The gradual abolition of unreasonable discrimination against the migrants, commerce and treaty relations of certain Far Eastern countries insofar as such discriminations are inconsistent with those general principles of equity and reciprocity that we have agreed must prevail.

3. Recognition of the need for a change in the status and principles governing the control of colonial and semi-colonial territories. This means:

(a) Equality of opportunity and equal access to the raw material resources of these areas.

(b) The creation of new machinery and methods for their administration in a spirit of trusteeship with a view to the well-being, education and development of the native inhabitants and their training in every possible way for the responsibilities of self-government.

4. Recognition of the fact that there are certain fundamental rights which must be guaranteed to every individual. This means:

(a) That every person of every country is entitled to the freedom that comes from such inalienable rights as

the right to say and think and express himself as he pleases, subject, only, to those legal limitations that operate within a constitutional democracy—the right to worship as he pleases—the right to combine in trade unions or other associations.

(b) That these fundamental individual rights must be guaranteed regardless of the particular form of government that may operate and that in the interests of world peace such guarantee must be an international collective responsibility.

5. The adoption by every nation of an economic policy which will serve both nationally and internationally to lift the living standards of those whose standards are unduly depressed with the object of achieving the maximum measure of economic equality and social justice between person and person and between nation and nation. This means:

(a) That there can be no return to the philosophy of rugged individualism but that economic effort in future must be consciously guided to serve the highest ends of human welfare.

(b) That those nations who are more advanced in a material sense must be prepared to contribute generously in aiding the industrial development of the more "backward" nations, irrespective of the prospects of any immediate financial reward.

(c) That the first charge on goods and services must be the care of those who for any reason are unable to make proper provision for themselves—the old, and the young—the sick and the ailing—and, *above all, those who have helped to fight and win the war and who have suffered in so doing.* That after these charges have been met, those who render useful service are entitled to the full fruits of their labors.

6. The establishment of some form of international authority with subsidiary regional authorities with the power and the means at their disposal to facilitate the progressive realization of these objectives and to enforce collective guarantees. This means:

(a) That many of the principles and procedures accepted by the United Nations as essential for a total war effort—including particularly Lend-Lease and the pooling and allocation of combined production and resources, will need to be carried on into the era of peace.

(b) That the aggressor nations must be completely and immediately disarmed once they have been defeated.

(c) That effective machinery must be created as soon as possible for international arbitration and for the application of collective economic sanctions, backed by an international police force for the purpose of restraining and, if necessary, forcibly resisting any future threat to the world's peace.

(d) That whatever international or regional authorities are created will be responsible for enforcing the guarantee I have suggested as essential for a stable and expanding world society—namely, strict observance of:

1. The Rule of Law.
2. The Principle of Equal Right to Develop and Progress.
3. The Trusteeship Control of "dependent" areas.
4. The Fundamental Rights of Individuals.
5. The Shaping of Economic Policies to offer greater social security and a better life for all people.

There is, I believe, surprisingly widespread agreement on general objectives among the peoples, the Governments and the leaders of the United Nations. But objectives are not enough; we must have organization as well, and on the organizational side very little has been accomplished. Yet we already have in existence organizations that have been evolved for the purpose of running a global war which can very easily be transformed into organizations for constructing a global peace. There is the "Combined Raw Materials Board," the "Combined Production and Resources Board," the

"Combined Food Board" and the "Anglo-American Food Committee," the "Munitions Assignment Board," the "Combined Shipping Adjustment Board," the "Combined Chiefs of Staff" and other organizations through which the war effort of America and Britain at least, has been closely organized. Nearly all these organizations could carry out exactly the same functions in time of peace as they are carrying out today in time of war.

The Raw Materials Board could still go on deciding what materials are required and how available stocks can best be utilized for meeting the urgent demands of peacetime industry. The Production and Resources Board could continue its job of maximizing production of what can reasonably be defined as essential commodities, equipment and services and ensuring their availability to those countries whose need is greatest. The Food Board could be responsible for the distribution of food, firstly to the starving peoples of Europe and Asia and, eventually, so as to ensure a world-wide standard of good nutrition. Assignment Boards could carry on their functions except that assignments would be determined not by military-strategic considerations, but by considerations of economic and social welfare. It would be their job to see that commodities and production facilities were made available according to capacity to produce, on the one hand, and relative need on the other. The Shipping Adjustment Board could allocate the ships which will be as precious then as they are now. And all these arrangements could be organized within the framework of a policy in which not only the United States but every industrial country will participate and under which every raw material producing country

could make a reciprocal contribution to the common welfare.

Unfortunately, we have not yet ready, even in its most minute skeleton form, any peacetime organization which can serve to give strategic unity and direction to our reconstruction and development offensive. We must create such an organization, or at least the nucleus of such an organization, as soon as possible.

We must create a World Reconstruction Council which should begin its meetings before the war ends, so that it can carry on the moment peace arrives. It would have to represent all the leading United Nations; it would have to be something more than the present Combined Chiefs of Staff, for the truth is that we have not yet in the United Nations war effort any centrally controlled political body. There is no War Cabinet for the United Nations as a whole. There is not one body which meets and decides on their common policy; such a body is needed for the successful prosecution of the war, as well as for the successful building of the peace.

The linking up of all peoples who are fighting for freedom must, I believe, be accompanied by the establishment of parallel machinery and procedures by which a positive program can be mapped out for carrying on a world at peace. To this end, I suggest the setting up *now* of a World Reconstruction and Development Council with subsidiary Council organized on a regional basis.

Briefly stated, the job of these Reconstruction and Development Councils would be to work out peace logistics—to readjust stock positions—to deal with the problem of surpluses after the war—arrange for the

continuance of a procedure that will enable plant, equipment and raw materials to be transferred to countries where the need is greatest,—and generally to see that commodities and production facilities are made available where they will satisfy urgent physical needs and foster productive development.

It is inevitable, of course, that while the war lasts, reconstruction and developmental work will be confined, in the main, to preparation of plans and working out of procedures so that as soon as the time arrives the transition from war to peace can be effected smoothly and with a minimum of disturbance and distress. The job of assembling the necessary data—of finding a basis of common action—of formulating specific proposals—this, in itself is likely to tax the ingenuity of the wisest men and women. We cannot start too soon.

We must see to it that ability to produce on the one hand and the need to consume on the other hand, are linked together for the benefit of all. I believe that in spite of the destruction and the havoc which the war will leave behind, man's resources for production, his technical knowledge and creative genius, if developed to the maximum, will give no excuse for anything but improvement in the level and security of living standards throughout the world. The limiting factor will not be the niggardliness of nature—it will be the lack of ability or experience in transforming natural resources into every day needs—it will be the capacity we show in organizing our resources that will set the limit to what we may enjoy. Economic individualism will not solve our problems. It will take collective planning and co-operative minds both to make the best of our resources

and to ensure that human needs are satisfied to the utmost. The minds are there already for the organization of war. I am confident that when the full advantages are understood, they will be there also to organize for peace.

"People who have learned by their experience in this war" states one keen-minded observer "the inherent productive possibilities of the nation, will not easily be persuaded that goods enough for all can be turned out only in time of war. The making of full employment and full production an integral part of a social program to be won along with the war, will have strong support from those who have seen its possibility." I believe one might safely go further than that and suggest that ordinary men and women everywhere will demand as a condition of the peace, the progressive realization of these possibilities of economic welfare and security which the experience of the war has so clearly demonstrated.

The nature of our post-war settlement will necessarily be influenced by the policies we follow and the conditions we create—during the war itself. It will certainly not wait upon events. It is tremendously urgent, therefore, that we start thinking, planning and preparing now for the kind of world we want to live in when the war is over. We must decide now because if at the close of this war we permit a sense of frustration and disillusionment to develop, the stage will most assuredly be set for a further conflict. And is not the possibility that such a calamity may visit civilization once more enough to make us think now even when our very

existence is threatened, in more than vague, general terms, of the peace to come?

Our job, then, will not have finished when the war is won. True, we must destroy utterly and completely, the totalitarian regimes of Germany, Italy and Japan—we must free the world now and forever from both the fact and fear of all that these systems stand for. But our determination to destroy must be matched by an equally strong determination to build—and this tremendous constructive effort that must follow victory will require as much courage—as much careful planning—perhaps no less material sacrifice and certainly more tolerance and understanding—than the military struggle on which our present energies are concentrated.

There is no easy road to success and no short-cut. This will be a slow and painful journey all the way. But if the ends of democracy and freedom are kept steadily in view—if we approach each obstacle in a spirit which compels everywhere and on all occasions, the subordination of special privilege to common end—I believe that the men and women of the United Nations will accept, and cheerfully accept, whatever sacrifices may be demanded as the price of victory.)

Then will we have a real chance of building a people's peace.

This war is a war that is being fought by the people. We must ensure that its results are secured for the people. An all-out battle for an all-in security—let that be our single-minded objective.

NORWAY

A Norwegian Point of View

By EDVARD HAMBRO, *international lawyer. He was director of the Norwegian Institute of Foreign Relations in Bergen, Norway at the time of the German invasion; served in the campaign as liaison officer to the British Expeditionary Force in Norway; took a chair in modern history at Northwestern University but after one year resigned to devote all his time to Norwegian interests.*

I

Immediately after the German invasion of Norway, on the night of April 9th, 1940, the Norwegian Parliament unanimously (in conformity with the provisions of the Constitution) authorized the King and the Cabinet to reside outside Norway, if it should prove necessary for the continued war-effort of the country. And the Cabinet was given full powers to act for the nation until a new session of Parliament could take place.

On June 7th the King, with the Cabinet, the President of the Parliament and what armed forces could get across, evacuated from Northern Norway. London became the seat of the Norwegian Government. From London the Norwegian war-efforts have been organized on land, on sea and in the air. And the Government in London has also to organize the preliminary work for Norway's participation in the peace conference.

In Norway itself nearly three million human beings are fighting without arms in a cruel war for national survival. They have suffered, struggled and hoped. These men and women who have dedicated their lives to the freedom of their country, have written new glorious pages in the book of human liberty. No peace would be possible without the epic fight and heroic resistance of the people in the occupied countries. These tortured millions under German oppression have a moral claim not only to be heard, but to have a decisive voice for their nations at the conference for post war settlement. The peace should not only be made for them, or with them, but by them.

II

The United Nations are fighting for the same ideals and the same way of life. They have all subscribed to the Atlantic Charter. In the broad lines their war aims are identical. But their geographic position and their traditions may create certain differences in outlook and conception.

Norway has no axe to grind. There are no Norwegian minorities to be reclaimed, no frontiers to be corrected, nor distant colonies to be coveted.

But every country, which in this war has been forced to fight a defensive war against its own will, has one aim of the most immediate importance. That is to drive the enemy out of the occupied territory and the first task after the retreat of the beaten enemy is relief to the starving and suffering population.

The united home front has kept up the fight in order to secure Norwegian independence and freedom.

Ideologists who dream and talk glibly of a world state and a super-government fail to realize that the common man has fought this war to get his country back, to save the soul of the nation. For him freedom and independence must be the first and most important aim. He wants to preserve the culture and social and political structure of his country. He wants to be master in his own house and solve his own problems.

On the other hand, it is realized, in occupied countries perhaps more than in any free country, that absolute and unlimited national sovereignty ultimately leads to international chaos and destruction. The Norwegians also know that there can be no independence without international interdependence.

They will be participants in a world organization for the preservation of peace after this war. Statesmen and publicists have already declared this so often that it should need no more emphasis.

They discuss the forms of such an organization even more ardently during this war than they did during and immediately after the last war. They are concerned with realities and not with words. One does not state a complicated problem more clearly or bring about its solution more rapidly by indulging in word fetishism. The question is not whether the organization shall be a "League," a "union," a "confederacy" or a "confederation."

It is not even practical to try to decide whether the organization should be regional or universal. It must be both. Because no universal organization can be made

workable without certain regional sub-groupings. And no regional system can secure lasting peace without some universal superstructure.

This is fully realized in Norway. Ships flying the Norwegian flag can be seen in all ports and on all oceans. The sea has been our highway for hundreds of years. The vikings sailed from town to town in their own country. They crossed the North Sea and the Mediterranean in their open ships. They reached Iceland, Greenland and America. Their descendants have inherited the knowledge that the sea unites. It does not sever. A system of continental blocs seems to them entirely unrealistic. But world consciousness has not made them blind to the nearest needs.

The Northern countries collaborated closely in many fields between the First and the Second World War. They proved that neighboring states could go very far in helping themselves and helping each other. They gave a fine example of regional understandings.

Norway was also active in another group which has attracted some interest: The Oslo Group. This group consisted of the Scandinavian States, Belgium, Luxemburg, and the Netherlands. They arrived at certain economic arrangements among themselves and were perhaps the only states to fight actively against increasing economic nationalism at that time. (1936-1938)

This was not a regional group. These countries were not neighbors. But they had certain interests in common in the field of foreign trade and finance. Being also members of the League of Nations these states proved that a universal organization can—and indeed must—be

strengthened by regional groups and common-interest groups.

III

Legal traditions and democratic ideals are very deeply rooted in the Norwegian mind. The first national law code was promulgated in the year 1225. But formal laws adopted by free men on the Ting had been in existence six or seven hundred years before that time.

The Norwegians feel that it is their task in international life to bring to the world the best traditions of their country. Respect for law is one of them. The official committee appointed by the Cabinet to prepare a Norwegian draft for the Covenant of the League of Nations in 1918 stressed the importance of international law.

The Norwegian Supreme Court has a place in the constitutional life of that country similar to the place held by the Supreme Court of the United States. And it is felt in Norway that there must also be an international Supreme Court of a similar importance. International law, a system of international courts and respect for judicial decisions must be the basis for the post-war organization.

This respect for law and procedure does not mean that the Norwegians feel that international law, as yet, can solve all problems. The preservation of the existing order must not be an excuse for freezing the status quo. Facilities for "Peaceful Change" and "International Legislation" must be developed. "Outlawry of War" is an empty phrase if we do not fight against the causes of war. It is of paramount importance to realize that the

most serious conflicts are solved outside the law courts in international life as within the national states. Procedures must be found to solve such conflicts without recourse to violence. International law can help to create such procedure, and respect for international law will enhance the importance of it.

Within a general system of "collective security" such procedures will be developed and international law will take its rightful place. It is one link only, but a very important link in the chain against lawlessness and violence.

IV

The President of the Norwegian Parliament said in a speech from the Metropolitan Opera on January 9, 1943:

"The small nations have no unreserved faith in Great Power democracy. They are not passing through this furnace of suffering to be told by other Governments what their fate shall be."

This statement is the expression of a great reality in international affairs. The small states in the world fear secret diplomacy and Great Power imperialism. They want to sit at the peace conference and they feel that they not only have a right to do so for their own sake, but that they have important contributions to make to the future of the world.

This does not mean that the Norwegians believe in the infallibility of the small states or that the Great Powers should be shorn of their rightful influence. Power and responsibility must be united. If the Russian

army, the British navy or the American air force—to mention some examples—should be called upon to act as police, it stands to reason that the Soviet Union, the British Commonwealth of Nations or the United States would and should have a great influence before the decision is taken. But it will be necessary to control this power. One cannot expect that any of the smaller states will feel perfectly secure in a world dominated by an Anglo-American dictatorship based on sea power, or by a Russian predominance based on the Red Army. It is regrettable, but it is true that the small nations so far have not always felt that the Great Powers have been utterly unselfish in deciding the fate of some of the smaller states.

The system after this war must be such that a workable compromise can be found between the rigid idea of absolute equality between states and the legitimately predominant influence of Great Powers. The frictions—if such there be—between small states and Great Powers would largely disappear the moment an organization was brought into being which did not rely upon national armament as the arbiter of nations.

If this war shall not have been fought entirely in vain, one must hope for a system which will eliminate the alleged differences of interests between small and large states since they are all united in the same ideals of world government.

It is interesting to note that the United States has never seen a bloc of big, densely populated and rich states lined up against the poor, sparsely populated and small ones. This might be an indication that the con-

licts between small and great states might disappear in the future.

v

The colonial question must also be faced with far-sighted realism. It is already realized that the economic importance of colonies is not of the first magnitude. It is also realized by progressive minds that an international control of colonies is a good and right thing. The Mandates System of the League of Nations was a step in the right direction.

The colonies of Germany and Turkey were handed over to the Allied and Associated Powers after the last war. They decided that these territories should be administered under the control of the League of Nations. Many people asked themselves at that time: "If this system is right for the German and Turkish colonies, would it not, then, be right also for the Belgian, the British, the Dutch, the French, the Italian, the Japanese and the Portuguese colonies?" They still ask these questions.

Some kind of international control of colonies—or rather of all territories inhabited by people who cannot yet rule themselves—ought to be established. The important thing is how and not by whom a colony is administered. The rule over them and control with them must be organized in such a way that it is of less importance who actually has the possession of them.

This same consideration applies also to other territories. International problems are very seldom solved by a change of national boundaries. Such changes have

taken place from time to time all through history—and new wars were waged to change the boundaries again. The way of the future is not to change national frontiers but to diminish their importance. It will never be possible to draw a frontier satisfactory to everybody concerned. There will always be clashes between racial, historic, linguistic, natural and strategic considerations. The only solution of this dilemma is to organize the world in such a way that it will not be of too great importance to the individual on which side of the border he lives.

VI

This war is fought for the common man, to make the world a better place for him to live in.

A legal and political organization is the first step to secure this. But it is not more than a step. Life must be organized within this organization.

Economic, social and cultural tasks must be taken up and fulfilled. There is no real peace in the world if nations can go on fighting each other with economic and financial means.

Norway has particular reasons to know this. With a population slightly under three million inhabitants she has a merchant fleet larger than all other fleets except those of Great Britain and the United States. She has a relatively larger number of sailors and a greater tonnage per inhabitant than any other nation. Her trade likewise is world-wide in scope.

A freer circulation of merchandise will, therefore, be among the most prominent peace aims. Tariff barriers must be reduced, quota systems and discriminations in

trade and finance must be abolished or placed under international control.

VII

International as well as national life is based on individuals. The world must be planned not only for states, but also for the individuals living in these states.

This was, to some extent, realized in the Treaty of Versailles, and certain steps were taken to protect the individual. This was done by the League of Nations under the minority treaties and also by the International Labor Organization.

Both these types of protection were dear to the Norwegian mind; and Norway has some contributions to make in the field of social progress and labor legislation.

From the time of the sagas decency and honesty were held in higher esteem than material success. It was early realized that political democracy would remain an empty shell if there was not also a certain degree of democracy in the economic and social sphere. The policy of the country has been not only to give scope for the active and healthy but also to improve the lot of the poor, to create possibilities for the weak and to protect and help the old and the sick. It has been considered more important to abolish want and poverty than to create wealth for the few.

Norway (with the other Northern States) has for a long time been considered among the pioneers in the field of progressive social legislation. It will cause deep and bitter disappointment among the Norwegian population if this war does not lead to social improvement all over the world.

VIII

International collaboration is necessary in the field of trade and labor legislation. But it is also necessary in the field of humanitarianism, fight against disease and improvement of cultural standards.

The name of Fridthjof Nansen and the Nansen Office for Refugees still bear witness to the lead taken by a great humanitarian from the North. Due to Nansen it was possible immediately after the last war to secure the necessary amount of collaboration to save some 400,000 prisoners of war in Russia.

The magnificent work done under the leadership of the League of Nations to save Europe from pestilence after the last war points the way for the future. So do the League's International health service, the institute for tropical disease in Singapore (moved to Australia for the duration), the work against drugs and against trade in women and children. This work must be continued and its scope be enlarged after the war.

Norway feels also particularly interested in international cultural co-operation. Oslo is the seat of the Institute for Comparative Cultural Research. And the Scandinavian States have taken the lead in other aspects of this work. A committee of scholars from all the Scandinavian countries was appointed some years ago to revise the textbooks of history so that Inter-Scandinavian history could be taught in the same way in all the countries. This same end—namely a closer cultural understanding—was also promoted by Inter-Scandinavian guest performances on the stages, Inter-Scandi-

navian lecture trips and exchange of workers, pupils and teachers.

This Scandinavian experience points the way to an intensification of the work already promoted by the International Institute of Intellectual Co-operation.

And chief among the tasks in this field must be some kind of international supervision of education. It is an international crime to use the educational system of the state to create intolerance, hatred and international friction instead of understanding and a spirit of world fellowship.

The so-called non-political co-operation in all fields is of the greatest political importance. Every step taken to facilitate such co-operation is a step toward a better world organization. Every question solved by international collaboration is a corner-stone in the building for the world of tomorrow.

IX

No picture of Norwegian peace aims,—not even the most superficial one—would be complete without some mention of the future of Scandinavia.

After a very turbulent childhood and adolescence with cruel wars every second generation, the Scandinavian States have lived in peace as fully independent and individual states since the early part of the last century. And they continued the close collaboration which had started in the early part of the nineteenth century when Norway and Sweden were still united.

Scandinavian collaboration in cultural and practical fields in legislation and in neutrality policy, had made

these states the example of peaceful and fruitful co-operation on a regional basis.

This unity does not appear solid today.

Norway is an active fighter side by side with her Allies. She is one of the United Nations.

Sweden is neutral.

Finland is fighting actively against the United Nations.

Denmark was occupied by the German war machine without being able to put up any military resistance.

Iceland is under friendly occupation by the United Nations.

It is yet too early to say what shape the Scandinavian collaboration will take in the future or to which extent it will be possible.

There will be deep and festering wounds to be healed. Still, there is little doubt that some kind of collaboration will take place.

Norway's place after this war, as during it, is with the United Nations. Norway is an Atlantic Power facing West. All her traditions and all her interests bind her with the Powers of the Atlantic, with the maritime states. This, however, does not prevent her from collaborating closely with her neighbors.

Denmark and Iceland are North Sea states and have links with the Atlantic States in the same way as Norway. The Danes and the Icelanders undoubtedly long to take part in the democratic world order of the future. This also applies to Sweden. Traditions, kinship of race and language, deep-rooted sympathies and common interests link her with Denmark and Norway. And the preponderant part of the Swedish people has no sym-

pathy whatsoever with the Nazis. The same applies to a great extent to Finland. Her peasants and workers—and they constitute the larger part of the population—have no love for the Nazi doctrines and have in the past shown their sympathy for Scandinavian collaboration.

Norway will, after the peace, continue to work for a peaceful organization of the world and for good neighborly relations with the Scandinavian States. The country realizes that the peace is a foundation for the future and not a reckoning with the past—and that the future must build on the past. The vast store of international experience of the last two decades must be used, the existing machinery must not be discarded.

THE PHILIPPINES

"The aims of the Filipinos in this war, our hopes, our aspirations are the same as your own. In the great moral causes—the principles of righteousness, of liberty, of peace—the United States and the Philippines are in complete accord with one another; they are in absolute and hearty accord."—*President Manuel Quezon of the Philippines, Before the U. S. Senate, June 4, 1942.*

The Meaning of a Pacific Charter

By JOAQUIN M. ELIZALDE: *Resident Commissioner of the Philippines to the United States, member of the Cabinet, Commonwealth of the Philippines since 1941.*

To the Philippines, as to the United States, war came with a stunning rapidity, and we, like the rest of the world, were caught unawares. In years to come, perhaps, we can place the blame for this unpreparedness. But the problem before us now—that of winning the war—is of such magnitude that we must call upon all our sources of strength and root out all our sources of weakness. It is with one important aspect of this task that this article is concerned, namely, enlisting the active co-operation of the peoples of Asia in the struggle against the Axis Powers.

The battle of the Pacific thus far has been going against the United Nations. The heroic stand of General MacArthur and his Filipino and American troops,

and the loyalty of the Filipino people to the United States comprise almost the only bright features in an otherwise gloomy scene. But there is the shining hope that the Philippine example can be duplicated in other parts of Asia and so turn the tide of war.

Why are the Filipino people fighting with such vigor? No one in the Pacific theatre of war is today fighting with greater resolution. I can give you the reason for this. The People of the Philippines have something to fight for.

We are fighting because our soil has been invaded. We are fighting out of friendship for and gratitude to the people of the United States. But, above all, we are fighting to protect the freedom and democracy which are as much a part of our spirit as they are of yours.

Every Filipino is convinced that Japanese occupation would mean the disappearance of his personal liberty. A similar spirit has helped China battle Japan to a standstill. China is fighting for a chance to complete the development of her own democracy.

In contrast, it is the blunt truth that some of our neighbors in Southeastern Asia have never had a spiritual objective for which to fight. The people of Indo-China, for instance, shamefully surrendered to the Japanese invaders. Why? Because the people of Indo-China, unfortunately, had been given no incentive to fight for the freedom of their country.

May this not be the case in most of the countries now being overrun by Japan?

Before the fall of Java, I read a dispatch from Batavia that seemed to demonstrate a complete misconception of the implications of this war. It read in part:

"Our forces are strongly defending the white man's obligations to protect the subject races, thus preparing a basis for respect as soon as their return becomes possible."

What an absurdity. What a lack of understanding. To the people of my country a statement such as this would be painful and discouraging. It would be felt to be an attack upon our self-respect. From the very beginning we have been conscious of our responsibilities in this struggle. We want to feel that we are fighting in partnership with America and the United Nations and not as mere tools.

Every country at war with the Axis today—and particularly the people of the Southwestern Pacific—should be given the same objective. When that is done, the burden of the United Nations will be minimized and a more vigorous partnership will result.

Many Americans are apt to think of Asia merely as a string of names on a map, as the scene of repeated campaigns of conquest, possessing no special identity of its own. There is a strong tendency to overlook the fact that this strategic area is the home of one half the human race, people who can and should strongly influence the outcome of the great struggle now in progress.

These millions and millions of human beings breathe and eat, and dream and think and hope as all of us do. Some are poor and some are rich. Some are masters and some are workers. But they all feel, and they all have some comprehension of what is going on in the world, dim though that comprehension may sometimes be. From this great mass of people there springs the same deep devotion to ideals that is found in the democra-

cies of the West. I think I may say in all humbleness that the example of the Philippines has proved that those who fight in defense of freedom—the people who have something to fight for—are the most resolute and unconquerable soldiers in the world.

America, of its own free will, gave the Philippines a pledge of independence. Filipinos fight heroically under the American flag today, because they know that in so doing they are fighting for the future of their own nation.

But in neighboring areas of Asia the situation is quite different.

It is frequently said that in this war one-fifth of the population of the world supports the Axis, and that the remaining four-fifths is behind the United Nations. This statement has been made so repeatedly that I fear it is generally believed. But let us ask ourselves: Is it true? Can we really depend on the co-operation of four-fifths of the world against the Axis?

If the events in the Southwestern Pacific are any indication, I think we could more safely say that this war matches one-fifth of the world against just another fifth. It seems to be an unfortunate truth that the remaining three-fifths—at least half a billion people—have no acute interest in the war or even a clear understanding of the issues involved.

In Asia there is a great mass of colonial subjects who today merely stand on the side-lines. And if they have nothing better to hope for in the future than the brand of imperialism they have known in the past, I for one can understand their reluctance to side wholeheartedly with the United Nations.

Truly, the choice that is offered Asia today is an unhappy one. That great continent must decide between supporting an archaic system of imperialism or accepting a cruel future of Japanese exploitation under the false slogan: "Asia for the Asiatics." Yet, I am firmly convinced that these millions would more readily follow the banner of democracy than that of Axis totalitarianism. Their own oriental philosophies, as various as they are, violently reject the concept of a master race, and of the exaltation of the State over the human spirit.

Yet we cannot depend on negatives to rally Asia to positive action. It cannot be won over on the basis of the old colonial system. That day has gone. The world must offer Asia something more than the cold comfort of superior protection and patronage. Here is half the human race, available for mobilization in the defense of democratic ideals and principles. Here is a huge mass of people ready to confront Japanese and German armed might with truly enormous resistance. Can we not find a way to win them over to the common cause?

Abraham Lincoln said that God must love the common people because he made so many of them. In Asia, we have nearly a billion common people. They must be aroused to take their place as our allies.

Nor is apathy and disinterest the only alternative for these people. We must beware not to turn them into our foes. Of course, it is easy to say that we must win them to our side. The problem is how to do it. For something concrete must be done. Time is running short. Japan has already overrun the Philippines, Indo-China, Thailand, Malaya, and the East Indies. Today she is beating at the door of India.

Recently, President Roosevelt, in his address to the Nation, made three commitments of tremendous importance to the people of Asia. First, the President stressed that the Atlantic Charter applies to the whole world. Second, he held forth the four freedoms—freedom from want, freedom from fear, freedom of thought, and freedom of religion to the people of the Pacific; and finally, he declared in all solemnity that a prime objective of this war is the establishment of the right of self-determination for all people. In these three historic points, there would seem to be the nucleus of a program under which the unity of all countries resisting the Axis may be achieved.

I do not pretend to speak with authority or with profound judgment in the suggestions I wish to submit here. A subject as complex and far-reaching as this must have the attention—yes, the concentration—of the ablest minds in the world. Personally, I have no doubt that considerable thought has already been given it by the leaders of the great democratic governments. At any rate, I make this suggestion: Would it not be wise at this time to put into active operation a Pacific Council, to deal immediately with the social, political, and economic problems that confront Asia today? Such a Council could immediately forge mighty weapons for intensified prosecution of the war against the Axis and its philosophy in the far East. It would be a great spur to civilian resistance in conquered territory. This organization might also begin work at once on a plan for the social and economic readjustment of post-war Asia.

A declaration of principles—a Pacific Charter—could be worked out, proposing the extension of liberal, pro-

gressive, free democracy to Asia. Such a declaration, paralleling the Atlantic Charter, would be a mighty appeal to the people of lands overrun by the Axis or threatened with invasion. This proposed Pacific Charter should assert unequivocally the right of all people to choose the form of government under which they will live, and should guarantee social and economic justice for all.

The promulgation of such a Pacific Charter would strike a fatal blow at Japanese efforts to turn aggression into a holy war of Asia against the world. It would serve notice that this war is not being fought for the furtherance of imperialistic supremacy, but for the principles of liberty and the right of all men to live. We must understand that the principles and ideals of democracy are valid in any part of the world. Where those ideals and principles have been established in the lives of the people of Asia, they have been warmly embraced and cherished as fundamental values. Asia can and must be made to understand the simple truth that this war is also its war, and that victory would be Asia's victory as well.

POLAND

The Sights Are Set

By STEFAN DE ROPP, Director of the Polish Information Service in the United States.

For centuries Poland has occupied an animated historical region where great people's movements swept towards the West. In historical times Poles have peopled lands much farther to the West than Berlin, as is borne out by Polish names of towns and villages in the heart of Germany. More than half of the villages between Berlin and Stettin bear Polish names. Many of the German place names in their present form even have a definite Polish meaning, but none in German.

But the Germanic recoil went far beyond its ethnic limits and a wall of struggle arose marking Polish western boundaries with unceasing German aggression. This historic phenomenon has repeated itself so persistently that the Western Slavs have come to regard German aggression as a natural constituent of the German mind. Taught by secular experience they distrust the written promises which Germany has broken innumerable times. In this respect the classic behaviour of Germany during the twenty years separating the two World Wars has had its counterpart in every century from the time when the Teutonic Knights broke their solemn oath made to Poland under Jagello in the 15th

Century. The vituperations of the have-nots whereby Germany used to extort from a cowed Europe means with which to arm, were not taken seriously in Poland when it was remembered that in 1914 Germany, provided with numerous colonies and rich beyond the avarice of dream, attacked her Eastern neighbor all the same.

For this reason Western Slavs whose misfortune it is to be the peace-loving neighbors of a perennial war-loving Germanic cluster, held in an iron military discipline by a Prussian oligarchy, have come at last to recognize the futility of moral sanctions since their binding character is recognized by one side alone.

This thought permeates most of the deliberations of the Western Slavs when dealing with post-war reconstruction of Central and Eastern Europe. Thus was born the idea of a system of defense and economy stretching from the Baltic Sea to the Adriatic. Four countries: Poland, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia and Greece constituted by agreements, initiated at a meeting of the International Labor Organization in New York in 1941, a community presaging the System A-B. They organized a Planning Board devoted to research on the Central and Eastern European economy and social problems. The Board consists of a Steering Committee and four national groups of experts. Hitherto five sections have been formed and the work proceeds now in several directions including research on industrial capacities, agricultural reorganization, financial and trade elements and on short term post-war relief. In another field educational and social elements of the

situation are analysed by a group of experts of the four signatories.

It must be considered that the System A-B, to which the access of Austria, Hungary, Roumania, and Bulgaria, after United Nations' victory is expected, comprises more than 106 million inhabitants. The population is demographically prolific. The rate of increase is double that of Germany, 980,000 to the German 460,000. In more than two dozen raw materials, the System exceeds the German resources. In the military age-bracket it exceeds Germany threefold. If only means could be found to bind the System together by the application of measures designed to bring advantages of a political and economic nature, the System itself would prove one of the most potent elements of security in post-war Europe.

Such advantages are to be found primarily in the raising of standards of living of the depressed areas within the System. Common presentation of claims to raw material requirements, credit and transport facilities, speaking jointly in the name of a market of consumption representing 106 million people, speaking as a peaceful entity, bent on a creative evolution towards a balanced economy, democratic, socially progressive and a menace to no one, yet a potent element of security, such is the base upon which can be founded the political authority of the System A-B within the World Councils of tomorrow.

In this System Poland, although the largest, will be an equal democratic member. Her own problems will be those of equalizing agricultural and industrial needs. The great problem of Eastern Europe in the past has

been much the same as that of the world beyond the Seas: the problem of the agricultural depression. Factory production methods in agriculture have rendered all-round farming obsolete. Machine-cultivated huge tracts of land in Canada, Australia, the United States Middle West and Argentina, without the use of fertilizer, drainage, irrigation and the multiple rotation of crops and green nitrogenous fodders, on one hand, on the other the extensive pastures of South Africa, South America and Australia providing frozen meats in competition with the slaughter houses of Europe, all these extensive methods which impoverish the soils on their application, have yet had the potency of destroying the livelihood of the small farmer, and that they have accomplished not in Europe alone. Where the farmer had an industry on the upgrade to which he could turn to recoup his own failing rentability, there he fled from the rural to the urban environment and thus large industrial centers arose in countries rich in capital. Where industrialization was lacking owing to the scarcity of capital, as has been the case in Eastern Europe, there the poverty of the small farmer became the undoing of the whole economic system of those regions generating underconsumption and secondary repercussions throughout the world. This repartition of national income as between the farmer and the industrial worker so as to raise the standard of living and the consumption of the farmer, is the gravest problem of Poland on the threshold of a new lease of life.

The changing attitude with regard to the mechanism of capital investment and the revolution through which we have gone in this respect, have radically changed

the national capacities of self-propelled industrialization and thus for the building up of internal consumption. For the first time in history it has become a matter within the realm of practical planned economy to balance agricultural gains against industrial production. For the first time it is possible to take care of the national rate of increase of the population because the old slogan of being able to provide only so much work in excess of previous labor capacity as that represented by national savings for that period, has given way to a different theory of financing work, namely the theory of price levels. It is being tested at the present moment by the war economies of all the nations at war. This experience has proved that the contention expressed by the writer to the same effect in 1932, is correct and workable. It proves that it is possible to produce a condition of plenty by spending sums much in excess of savings as additional to the previous level of production without going into the inflational spiral given certain conditions of control, rendering the volume of goods in circulation adequate to the increased volume of domestic credit. The part reserved for international credit in such a system is that of reclaiming depressed areas, of initiating production where it has become stagnant by war destruction, and of supplying the first quotas of raw materials. Most of this credit is in the form of facilities for the purchase of goods and for this reason the "lease-lend" attitude bridging the gap between short and long term credit, should be most helpful and should to a much fuller extent tie the 106 millions of the System A-B to the American market.

Poland plans to build her economic and social

order on this new aspect of the investment policy. It would like to create a balance of national income as between city and rural population, and it must of course take care of half a million Poles born to the nation each year, provide for their education and for their employment with a slowly rising standard of living to keep up the industrial initiative and thus stimulate per capita production coefficients.

The other great problem which faces us all is to decide whether it is better to build up a regional economy based on large productive units or medium and small. In large productive units, the individual is submerged and mechanized. The human elements become integrated in narrow skills and also in peculiar leadership in which the meaning of true democracy is lost, and which builds up as often as not its own privileged labor aristocracy and its own pariahs and depressed classes. Without the psychology of democracy, without the humanitarian spirit of friendly social intercourse within labor organization which shuns elephantine dimensions and bureaucracy, without the intermixing of classes to such an extent that there should be only one of sincere neighborliness, the system of parliamentary representation alone will not in itself constitute democracy, as is well proved by the Weimar Republic or by the Soviet system. Quite the contrary: Social, political or economic pressure groups will cleave the nation with a greater harm to solidarity than internecine wars. For these reasons the general trend of opinion in Poland tends towards productive units of large dimensions, where for technical reasons their splitting or reduction in size is not practical, as for instance power stations, railways,

gasworks, certain elements of primary industries, etc. passing into the hands of State-controlled professional institutions. Most other productive capacity must remain in private ownership and should be of medium and small size, so as to humanize their functioning to the greatest possible extent and dilute ownership and democratize productive initiative. Thus the principle of ownership is turning away from anonymity, the personal contact is established between the owner and the worker and his family in a word, all that which makes for sympathy and understanding is being capitalized for the good of the collectivity. Within such communities real democracy is born, and of such democracies peace is constructed. Not the peace of slogans and speeches, but the peace of functions and strivings. The proof is in the working of the two most successful democracies the world has produced to date: the Swiss and the Danish. European civilization has produced none better and the goal Poland is placing before the avid vision of its suffering people is to equalize in measurable time and by greatest exertion of the whole people, young and old, the pattern set by the example of those two nations. The sights are not set too high. The purpose to which we are pledged is not utopian. It is Christian in spirit; it is essentially European, not Asiatic, in its intrinsic values, and it is profoundly humble and human in its attitude towards other nations. And what is perhaps morally paramount, it answers fully the hopes and aspirations of the Polish people for which they are fighting and dying daily by the thousands so that when the ashen skeletons of our homes resound again with the life and laughter of our children, that life might reflect their vision and ours.

UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA

The Free Spirit of Man or Foul Oppression *

By FIELD MARSHALL JAN CHRISTIAAN SMUTS, *Premier of the Union of South Africa.*

I pass on now to another point and wish to emphasize the deeper significance of the struggle on which we are engaged. It is no ordinary political issues that are at stake, and the outcome of this war will not be immaterial to the future character of our civilization. In spite of the specious promises of a new order and the alluring appeals to the idealism of youth, actual events have in the last three years revealed the true nature of Nazi ideology. We know now beyond all doubt what Hitler's new order means. Persecution, domination, suppression, enslavement of the free human spirit, extermination—these are the dominant features of the new creed as practised in the occupied countries. It is written in blood and tears and nameless sufferings of vast numbers of innocent men and women of all ages and conditions.

It is in contrast to this that I have emphasized the heroic spirit of the suffering Allied peoples now under Hitler's heel, because I feel that this is the heart of the matter. This, at bottom, is a war of the spirit, a war of

* Excerpt from address by Premier Jan Christiaan Smuts to the British Parliament Oct. 21, 1942.

man's soul. Hitler has tried to kill the spirit and to substitute for it some ersatz thing, something which is really negation. He has instilled into German youth a new racial fanaticism. He has sought strength in the ancient discarded forest gods of the Teutons. He has sunk into reversion to the pagan past and to denial of the spiritual forces which have carried us forward in the Christian advance which constitutes the essence of European civilization. He has trampled under foot the great creed which had proved the greatest dynamic of all human history and made western civilization the proudest achievement of man; he has trampled on the Cross and substituted for it the crooked cross, his symbol for the new devil worship which he has tried to impose on each country in the world. A Nazi superman is substituted for the Man of Nazareth as the new leader of the human race. He has stamped on the human virtues which we had learned to cultivate under the symbol of the cross. Decency, sympathy, mercy are not words found in this new code. He has trampled on the spirit of liberty which had become the accepted political creed of the modern world. He has started a new era of martyrdom for the human spirit, an era of persecution such as mankind had not known since it emerged from the Dark Age. The suffering he has inflicted on Jews and Christians alike, the tide of horror launched under his Gestapo regime over the fair west, constitutes the darkest page of modern history. He has outraged and insulted and challenged the very spirit of humanity and tried to found a new barbarism.

After what has happened since 1939 in the occupied countries and elsewhere both in peace and war, there is

no more doubt about the meaning of it all. The main issue has now become perfectly clear. This is a challenge to all we have learnt to value and to prize even above life itself. Behind all the issues of this war lies the deeper question now posed to the world: which do you choose, the free spirit of man which has shaped the values of our civilization, or this substitute, this foul oppression, now resuscitated from the underworld of the past? This, in the last analysis is what this war is about.

At bottom, therefore, this war is a new crusade, a new fight to the death for man's rights and liberties and for the personal ideals of man's ethical and spiritual life. To that fanaticism we oppose this crusading spirit which will not sheath the sword till martyrdom and all its works have been purged from this fair world. And in that spirit the United Nations will march forward to victory and to the world which will follow the victory.

I come to this question: what is the sort of world which we envisage as our objective after this war? What sort of social and international order are we aiming at? These are very important questions if we mean not only to win the war but also the peace. Our ideas of these matters 22 years ago were much too vague and crude and at the same time much too ambitious, with the result that when they came to be tested by hard experience they proved wanting. With that experience before us, we ought this time to hammer out something more clear, more definite. A great deal of thought is, no doubt, already being given to these matters and one may hope that we shall approach the peace much better informed and equipped than we were last time.

Certain points of great importance have already emerged. Perhaps they have suggested the name of the United Nations. This is a new conception, much in advance of the old concept of a league of nations. We do not want to be a league, but something more definite and organic, even if, to begin with, more limited and less ambitious than the League. The United Nations is, of course, a truthful conception, and on the basis of that conception much of the machinery for the functioning of an international order might well be restored.

Then again, we have the Atlantic Charter, in which certain large principles of international policy in the social and economic spheres have been accepted. That too marks a great step forward; it only requires more careful definition and elaboration to become a real Magna Carta of the nations.

Again, we have agreed on certain large principles of social policy involving modifications of our system in matters which have lain at the root of much social unrest and suffering in the past. We cannot hope to establish a new heaven and a new earth in the bleak world which will follow after this most destructive conflict of history, but certain social and economic evils could be tackled on modest practical lines, on an international scale, almost at once.

Then again, we have accepted the principle of international aid underlying the mutual aid agreement. The open hand in international life is already a matter of practical politics, and should be suitably extended after the war. This, too, is a far reaching innovation, pointing the way to fruitful developments in future.

All these are already indications of considerable ad-

vances to a better world and a richer life for man. To these we may add much of the social and economic work of the League of Nations. Much of the League organization could continue to function for the future wellbeing of mankind. In sober resolution, in modest hope, and in strong faith, we move forward to the unknown future. There is no reason why we should not hopefully and sincerely attempt to carry out for the world the task which now confronts us as never before in the history of our race.

An American statesman has called this the century of the plain man, of the common people. I feel that by the vast suffering through which our race is passing we are being carried to a deeper sense of social realities. We are passing beyond the ordinary politics and political shibboleths. It is no longer a case of Socialism or Communism or any of the other "isms" of the market place, but of achieving justice and fair play for all. The people are searching their own souls for the causes which have brought us to this pass. May it be our privilege to see that this suffering, which has troubled and seared man's spirit, shall this time not be in vain.

Without feeding on illusion, without pursuing the impossible, there is yet much in the common life of the people which can be remedied, much unnecessary inequality and privilege to be leveled away. Health, housing, education, decent social amenities, provision against avoidable insecurity—all these can be given and much more can be provided for, and thus a common higher level of life achieved for all. Between the nations a new spirit of human solidarity can be cultivated and economic conditions can be built up which will strike

at the root causes of war and help lay a deeper foundation for world peace.

With honesty and sincerity on our part, it is possible to make basic reforms both for national and international life which will give mankind a greater chance of survival and of progress. Let this program, by no means too ambitious, be our task and let us already now, even in the midst of war, begin to prepare for it. And may heaven's blessing rest on our work, in war and in peace.

UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

Soviet War Aims *

By PREMIER JOSEPH STALIN

I

Lenin differentiated between two kinds of war—wars of conquest, which are unjust wars, and wars for liberation, which are just wars.

The Germans are now waging a war of conquest—an unjust war, with the object of seizing foreign territory and conquering other peoples. Therefore, all honest people must rise against the German invaders as against enemies.

Unlike Hitlerite Germany, the Soviet Union and its allies are waging a war for liberation—a just war for the liberation of the enslaved peoples of Europe and the U.S.S.R. from Hitler's tyranny. Therefore all honest people must support the armies of the U.S.S.R., Great Britain and the other allies as armies of liberation.

We have not nor can we have such war aims as the seizure of foreign territories or the conquest of other

* Report made by Joseph Stalin, as Chairman of the State Defense Committee, at a meeting of the Moscow Soviet and representatives of other organizations, November 6th, 1941 on the eve of the Twenty-fourth Anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution.

peoples, irrespective of whether European peoples and territories or Asiatic peoples and territories, including Iran, are concerned. Our first aim is to liberate our territories and our peoples from the German Nazi yoke.

We have not nor can we have such war aims as the imposition of our will and our regime on the Slavic and other enslaved peoples of Europe who are waiting for our help. Our aim is to help these peoples in their struggle for liberation from Hitler's tyranny, and then to accord them the possibility of arranging their lives on their own land as they think fit, with absolute freedom. No interference of any kind with the domestic affairs of other nations.

This is our task. Now we can and must fulfill this task. Only by fulfilling this task and routing the German invaders can we achieve a lasting and just peace.

II *

The enemy is suffering defeat, but he has not yet been routed, and still less finished off. He will exert the last remnants of his strength to attain success. And the more defeats he suffers, the more furious he will become.

It is therefore necessary that the training of reserves to assist the front should not relax in our country for a single minute.

It is necessary that fresh army units should go to the front one after another to forge victory over the bestial enemy.

* Report by Joseph Stalin, February 23, 1942.

It is necessary that our industry, especially our war industry, should work with redoubled vigor.

It is necessary that the front should receive daily increasing quantities of tanks, planes, guns, trench mortars, machine-guns, rifles, automatic rifles and ammunition.

This is one of the Red Army's main sources of strength and might. But it is not the Red Army's only source of strength. The Red Army's strength lies above all in the fact that it is not waging a predatory, imperialist war, but a patriotic war, a war of liberation, a just war.

The Red Army's task is to free our Soviet territory from the German invaders, to free from the yoke of the German invaders the residents of our villages and towns, who were free and lived like human beings before the war and now are oppressed and suffer pillage, ruin and famine, and lastly to free our women from the disgrace and outrage to which they are subjected by the German Fascist fiends. What could be nobler and loftier than this task?

No single German soldier can say that he is waging a just war, because he cannot fail to see that he is forced to fight in order to plunder and oppress other peoples. The German soldier lacks a lofty, noble aim in the war which could inspire him and in which he could take pride. On the contrary, the Red Army man can proudly say that he is waging a just war, a war for liberation, a war for the freedom and independence of his motherland.

The Red Army pursues a noble and lofty war aim, which inspires it to heroic feats. This, properly speak-

ing, explains why the patriotic war brings forward thousands of heroes and heroines in our country, ready to face death for the freedom of their motherland. This is a source of strength to the Red Army. This is also a source of weakness to the German Fascist army.

Occasionally the foreign press engages in prattle to the effect that the Red Army's aim is to exterminate the German people and destroy the German State. This is, of course, a stupid lie and a witless slander against the Red Army. The Red Army has not and cannot have such idiotic aims. The Red Army's aim is to drive out the German occupants from our country and liberate Soviet soil from the German Fascist invaders.

It is very likely that the war for liberation of the Soviet land will result in ousting or destroying Hitler's clique. We should welcome such an outcome. But it would be ridiculous to identify Hitler's clique with the German people and the German State. History shows that Hitlers come and go, but the German people and the German State remain.

Lastly, the strength of the Red Army lies in the fact that it does not and cannot entertain racial hatred for other peoples, including the German people, that it has been brought up in the spirit of the equality of all peoples and races, in the spirit of respect for the rights of other peoples.

The Germans' racial theory and their practice of racial hatred have brought about a situation in which all freedom-loving peoples have become enemies of Fascist Germany. The theory of race equality in the U.S.S.R. and the practice of respect for the rights of other peoples have brought about a situation in which

all freedom-loving peoples have become friends of the Soviet Union. This is a source of strength to the Red Army. This is also a source of weakness to the German Fascist army . . .

Sometimes the foreign press engages in prattle to the effect that the Soviet people hates the Germans just because they are Germans, that the Red Army exterminates German soldiers just because they are Germans, because it hates everything German, and that therefore the Red Army does not take German soldiers prisoner.

This is, of course, a similar stupid lie and witless slander against the Red Army. The Red Army is free of feelings of racial hatred. It is free of such humiliating feelings because it has been brought up in the spirit of racial equality and respect for the rights of other peoples. Besides, one should not forget that in our country any manifestation of racial hatred is punished by law.

Certainly the Red Army must annihilate the German Fascist occupants, since they wish to enslave our motherland, and when, being surrounded by our troops, they refuse to lay down their arms and surrender. The Red Army annihilates them not because of their German origin but because they wish to enslave our motherland. The Red Army, like the army of any other people, is entitled and bound to annihilate the enslavers of its motherland, irrespective of their national origin.

III *

We are waging a patriotic war of liberation, a just war. We do not set ourselves the aim of seizing foreign

* From Joseph Stalin's report, May 1, 1942.

countries, of conquering foreign peoples. Our aim is clear and noble. We want to liberate our Soviet land from the German Fascist scoundrels. We want to liberate our brothers, the Ukrainians, Moldavians, Byelorussians, Lithuanians, Letts, Estonians and Karelians, from the disgrace and humiliation to which they are subjected by the German Fascist scoundrels.

To achieve this aim we must defeat the German Fascist army and exterminate the German occupants to the last man, as long as they will not surrender. There is no other way. We can do this and we must do this at any cost.

IV *

In this war of liberation we shall not be alone. In this great war we shall have loyal allies in peoples of Europe and America, including German people who are enslaved by Hitlerite despots. Our war for freedom of our country will merge with the struggle of peoples of Europe and America for their independence, for democratic liberties. It will be a united front of peoples standing for freedom and against enslavement and threats of enslavement by Hitler's Fascist armies.

* From radio address by J. V. Stalin, Chairman of the Council of People's Commissars of the U.S.S.R., Moscow, July 3, 1941.

THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

“The Four Freedoms” *

By PRESIDENT FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT

In the future days which we seek to make secure, we look forward to a world founded upon four essential human freedoms.

The *First* is freedom of speech and expression everywhere in the world.

The *Second* is freedom of every person to worship God in his own way—everywhere in the world.

The *Third* is freedom from want, which, translated into world terms, means economic understandings which will secure to every nation a healthy peace time life for its inhabitants—everywhere in the world.

The *Fourth* is freedom from fear, which, translated into world terms, means a world-wide reduction of armaments to such a point and in such a thorough fashion that no nation will be in a position to commit an act of physical aggression against any neighbor—anywhere in the world.

That is no vision of a distant millennium. It is a definite basis for a kind of world attainable in our own time and generation. That kind of world is the very antithesis

* Extract from President Roosevelt's message to Congress in January 6, 1941.

esis of the so-called "New Order" of tyranny which the dictators seek to create with the crash of a bomb. To that new order we oppose the great conception—the "moral order."

Foundations of the Peace*

By VICE-PRESIDENT HENRY A. WALLACE

I

In these days of world crisis, there are many who say, "Let us have no talk of peace until the war is won." There are others who have said, "Let us not think of helping to win the war until the details of the peace are completely settled." I believe the sensible and constructive course to take is this: Do everything we can to speed our drive for victory, because unless Hitler and his Italian and Japanese partners are defeated there will be only the cold, bleak hopelessness of a new Dark Age. At the same time, think hard and often about the future peace, because unless we and the other democracies have confidence in that peace our resistance to our enemies may not be strong enough to beat them.

Thinking of the future peace, in other words, is not searching for an escape from the stern realities of the present, not taking refuge in airy castles of our minds. From the practical standpoint of putting first things first, at a time when there are not enough hours in a day and every minute counts, planning for the future

* Reprinted with permission from the January 1942 issue of *The Atlantic Monthly*.

peace must of necessity be a part of our all-out war program. More than that, the daily actions being taken now by both Britain and ourselves are determining to a large extent the kind of post-war world we can have later on.

It seems almost certain that sometime within the next few years another peace will be written. If it should be a Hitler peace, no one but Hitler and his henchmen would be allowed any part in writing it. But if, with this country's determined participation and support, the Allies are successful, the world will have a second chance to organize its affairs on a basis of human decency and mutual welfare.

Again, as in 1919, there will be the question of what to do about the world's armies, the question of machinery to prevent new aggression, the question of what to do about national boundaries. And again, as in 1919, at the roots of all these knotty questions will be the fundamental problem of restoring the world's trade and of expanding economic activity so as to improve living standards everywhere.

We are now aware, after our experience of the last twenty-five years, that the most careful delineation of national boundaries is not in itself enough to prevent the world from suffering a repetition of the catastrophe of general war. Nor can this be prevented simply by the establishment of an international league. We know now that the modern world must be recognized for what it is—an economic unit—and that wise arrangements must be made so that trade will be encouraged. The foundations of democracy can be rendered safe only when people everywhere have an opportunity to work and buy

and sell with a reasonable assurance that they will be able to enjoy the fruits of their work.

Actually, the seeds of the present world upheaval were sown in the faulty economic decisions that followed the war of a generation ago. The vast sums of reparations imposed on Germany, however justified they may have been on moral grounds, were an indigestible lump in Europe's financial stomach. The war debts owed to the United States by the Allies were equally a handicap to trade. All over the world, the old international gold standard had broken down, and nothing effective was done to replace or restore it. Europe was left cut up into many small national units, and each of these units was left free to erect tariff and trade barriers as it pleased. Many nations, including our own, tried to buy as little as possible from the rest of the world and to sell as much as possible. European countries that normally bought wheat and meat from overseas shifted their production policies with a view to becoming self-sufficient in food. This not only lowered their own standard of living, but upset the economies of the exporting countries. The United States, newly become a creditor nation, adopted tariff policies which only a debtor nation could hope to live with, and in so doing helped make it certain that the world would go through hell.

The dislocations brought by that first World War and by the unwise management of the peace were especially hard on the raw-material producers of the world. Prices of raw materials are extremely sensitive to changes in demand or supply. Therefore, various groups of raw-material producers, including the farmers, found

themselves in serious trouble when their supplies were greater than demand. Wheat, cotton, sugar, coffee, rubber, copper—all these commodities were in chronic world-wide surplus during the post-war period. Producers of these commodities, wherever they were,—in this country, in South America, in the Dutch East Indies, in the British colonies, in other widely scattered areas,—were faced again and again with overproduction, underconsumption, and appalling losses. The fall in raw-material prices and the resulting lack of purchasing power of the raw-material producers became a serious threat to the well-being of countries everywhere.

For ten years after the first World War, the deadly economic malady afflicting the world was covered up by the billions in private loans floated by foreign borrowers in the United States. These loans were usually floated at high rates of interest and used for purposes which, for the most part, did not increase the borrowing countries' ability to pay either the interest or the principal. Thus they produced a temporary, though basically unsound, prosperity. When the stream of loans suddenly dried up, the flimsiness of this prosperity of gaudy tinsel was revealed, and the whole thing came crashing down.

We all are familiar with the sequence of events after 1929—the Hawley-Smoot Tariff Act in this country, the immediate retaliations in Canada and other countries, the failure of the *Credit-Anstalt* in Austria, the German financial collapse, the moratorium on war debts, the departure of England from the gold standard, the British Empire conference at Ottawa and the adoption of Empire preference tariff policies, the world-wide de-

pression, the bank panic in this country, the rise of Hitler in Germany, the gradual loss of prestige by the League of Nations in one crisis after another, and, finally, the outbreak of the present war.

In very truth this nation, during those early post-war years, was sowing the wind by its policies of isolation, high tariffs, unwise foreign loans, and high-pressure sales abroad. It could not avoid reaping the whirlwind. Hindsight is always easier than foresight, and millions of Americans now look back upon those earlier policies as tragically mistaken. It would be a prolongation of the present world agony if, after this war is over, any of us again put blinders on our hindsight.

Spokesmen for the isolationist point of view did not support President Roosevelt in his stand for a peace built around freedom of speech and expression, freedom of worship, freedom from want and freedom from fear. They were quick to condemn the President for having joined with Winston Churchill in subscribing to the Atlantic Charter. They saw dangerous foreign entanglements in such simple words of the President as these: "The co-operation which we seek is the co-operation of free countries, working together in a friendly civilized society."

We may wonder whether the long and bitter fight put up by the isolationists in the decade of the twenties to keep the United States from behaving as if it were part of the world is to be renewed when the time comes for building a new peace. What they do will have an important bearing on political alignments in the United States. The injection of such an issue into politics would ordinarily be nothing of which to complain, for surely

the people have a right to choose the policies they want the nation to pursue. But the really serious aspect of the matter is that the whole future not only of this country but of human civilization itself may depend on the ability and willingness of the American people to take the broad view.

For my part, I believe that the American people have profited from their experiences of the last twenty-five years. I believe that they will perceive, with increasingly clear vision, the place of leadership in the world which the United States can scarcely avoid occupying; and that they will support policies and arrangements for sensible co-operation with other countries.

One evidence of the more enlightened point of view is found in the wide understanding of the great practical difficulties in the way of this country's trying to receive billions of dollars in goods and services when the war ends, in exchange for the weapons and food now being shipped abroad under the Lend-Lease Act. There seems some merit in the often-heard suggestion that the United States will be well repaid if Britain and the other recipients of lend-lease materials enter genuinely, intelligently and wholeheartedly into co-operative relationships to ensure the world's economic and social stability after the war.

II

The peace aims which Roosevelt and Churchill have enumerated are splendid statements of principle. They open up big fields for exploration. The job now is to work out, as definitely as we can while the war is still

in progress, practical ways and means for realizing them.

Preliminary studies of some of the expected post-war problems already are being made by the Economic Defense Board and the Cabinet departments whose chiefs are members of that board. This is being done in accordance with the Executive Order of July 30, 1941, which directed the Board to "make investigation and advise the President on the relationship of economic defense . . . measures to post-war economic reconstruction and on the steps to be taken to protect the trade position of the United States and to expedite the establishment of sound, peacetime international economic relationships."

Now, what must be considered in establishing such "sound relationships" in peacetime? There are certain basic facts which cannot be ignored. One of these is the universal necessity of access to raw materials and the need for an economic arrangement to protect the raw-material producers of the world from such violent fluctuation in income as took place after World War I. Another is the indispensability of markets for goods produced. A third is the present existence in all countries of tariffs and other barriers to imports. A fourth is the use of gold as a base for national currencies and as a means of settling international trade balances. A fifth is the place of credit in stimulating international trade. A sixth is the close relationship between stable national currencies and the exchange of goods and services. A seventh, and most important of all, is the essential role of adequate purchasing power within the various countries that are trading with each other—for full employment within nations makes broad trade possible with

other nations. All these facts and factors are of prime importance in determining the state of the world's health, and they will naturally form some of the main ingredients of post-war economic planning, if it is to be done on a comprehensive scale.

Each of these aspects of world trade is a vast subject in itself, and I do not have space in this article to discuss them all. However, I do wish to point out that basic to any sensible ordering of the world's economic life is the stabilizing of the production and prices of raw materials.

During the '20s and '30s, when the raw-material producers were in such frequent trouble, various methods were developed to help them adjust themselves to the painful realities of diminishing demand. There were the Stevenson rubber plan, the Chadbourne sugar arrangement, the beginning of an international wheat agreement, and in the United States an Ever Normal Granary program. The plight of the producers was so difficult that in most of these remedies very little effort was made to think about the consumer. More than any of the other plans, the Ever Normal Granary in this country recognized consumer needs by setting up huge stock piles of wheat, cotton, and corn. The stated objective was to carry over the surplus from the fat years to the lean years, thus benefiting the producer in the years of overproduction and very low prices and helping the consumer in years when the supplies otherwise would be short and the prices high. As things turned out, our Ever Normal Granary stocks of corn made possible our quick and heavy shipments of pork and dairy products to Great Britain during this last year. Those of us who

formulated the Ever Normal Granary program had in mind that supplies might eventually be very helpful in case of war. But none of us at that time visualized also how important these supplies might be to the war-stricken territories during the years immediately following the declaration of peace.

As part of the effort to win the peace, I am hoping that what might be called the "ever normal granary principle" can be established for a number of commodities on a world-wide scale. It will be remembered that the fourth point of the eight points agreed upon by Roosevelt and Churchill in the Atlantic Charter mentioned the enjoying by all the states, great or small, victor or vanquished, of access on equal terms to the raw materials of the world. To give this lofty ideal a more definite substance should be one of our chief objectives in the months that lie immediately ahead. The people of all Europe should feel that there are available, in the United States, in Latin America, and in the British Dominions, tremendous quantities of raw materials which can be used for food, clothing, and shelter within a short time after the war comes to an end.

Thus far, there have been no definite arrangements between the United States and the British Empire or between the United States and Latin America with regard to handling the raw-material problems of the world in such a way as to make for a just peace. A beginning has been made along this line with the international wheat agreement meeting which was held in Washington last July. Nothing has yet been signed, but it is apparent that the United States, Argentina, Canada, and Australia, as well as Great Britain, are moving

in the direction of a World Ever Normal Granary, with export quotas and with prices stabilized at a point to be fair to producers and consumers.

The world cotton problem is similar in some ways to the world wheat problem, but less progress has been made toward orderly marketing arrangements for cotton than for wheat.

Huge surpluses of both cotton and wheat are piled up in the exporting countries, waiting to be used whenever the stricken countries are able once more to handle them. Of cotton, there is stored in the United States a supply sufficient to take care of the normal needs of all Europe for at least a year. Of wheat, the United States last July 1 had a carry-over about four times the normal of the '20s, and it is evident that next July 1 the carry-over will be nearly seven times the normal of the '20s. In Canada the situation is somewhat similar, while in Argentina and Australia large surpluses loom for the near future. Four great wheat-exporting nations of the world now have a billion more bushels on hand than they did during the first half of the '20s. This is approximately twice as much wheat as moved in world trade in the years preceding the outbreak of the war. It is enough wheat to feed the entire population of continental Europe for a large part of a year, or to cover the Continent's import requirements for nearly three years.

When the curse of the Nazi mailed fist is at last removed from the stricken countries overseas, the first and most pressing need will be action to bring food to the starving and the undernourished. For this purpose the accumulated surplus stocks of wheat and the increased

production of other foods for which farmers are now pushing will be enormously helpful. The pity is that there is no practical way to get this food to these people now without helping the Nazis and thus postponing the day of real liberation of these people from the Nazi yoke.

Besides food, the devastated regions will have urgent need of other materials and equipment to assist in their reconstruction. Homes, factories, office buildings, schools, churches, highways, railroads, bridges, have been destroyed in large numbers. In the tremendous job of rebuilding which must be undertaken, the United States and the other countries of the Western Hemisphere can play a vital part. Meanwhile, both strategy and humanity will be served if we take every opportunity to let the people of the occupied countries know that we intend to stand behind them in their efforts to get back on their feet. That will give them something to which to cling during their months or years of misery and will speed the day of a Nazi collapse and the emancipation of the world.

The democratic countries are in splendid position to organize themselves for rapid relief work as soon as peace comes. I am confident that we can do this job and do it well. But we must be looking ahead to the longer future and laying plans on more than just a temporary basis.

III

It is now clear that by the end of the war the non-Axis nations will have a greater production of raw materials, a greater output of manufactured products, and a

greater number of skilled workers than ever before in their history. Nearly half of their production may be going to the British and American governments by the time Hitler is overthrown. If two such customers were to drop out of the market abruptly, it would break everyone. Business men know this.

We in the democracies must begin to realize, therefore, that if we can afford tremendous sums of money to win the war, we can afford to invest whatever amount it takes to win the peace. If that necessity were accepted today, both here and in England, we could be writing a very important part of the peace now. Both nations could be making contracts with producers of raw materials throughout the world for delivery of their goods during the war and for several years beyond the armistice at reasonable prices and not at inflated prices. That would sharply reduce the cost of winning the war and give more assurance than any other single action that business is not going to be allowed to collapse after the fighting is over. There would be no better use to which this country's gold could be put than in making such purchases. Many of the goods bought in this manner for post-war delivery would have to be sold on credit by the British and ourselves for reconstruction within the devastated nations.

Just as individuals here and in England are being encouraged to build up future purchasing power for themselves through defense bonds and other devices, so raw-material-producing countries would by means of such a plan as this be accumulating purchasing power in the form of gold. This gold could be used in the

future for buying the finished goods of Europe and America.

Not only would the gold which these countries would thereby obtain make it possible for them to buy finished goods of Europe and America, but it could also be used in part to provide much needed strength for their currency and banking systems, and make it possible for them progressively to relax the stringent exchange controls, import quotas, and clearing arrangements which serve so effectively to restrict the flow of goods from country to country. Without adequate gold reserve and without the ability to obtain the kind of credit which can be utilized to pay for imports, a country is greatly handicapped in its conduct of foreign trade, and, in order to prevent its currency from depreciating in the foreign exchange market and its credit from deteriorating, finds itself forced to adopt illiberal trade policies and severe restrictions on its imports. With increased gold holdings countries will be able to pursue more effectively a policy of stable foreign exchange and liberal trade practices.

If we get the right kind of peace, we are sure to see the whole world within a few years operating on a much higher level of production than ever before and this would of course mean a greater world market for raw materials.

Given the right kind of peace, this prospect of greater world trade is certain to materialize, for it rests on the sure prospect of continued industrialization everywhere. The process of industrialization is the way to attain higher standards of living. Everywhere there are communities that must increase their proportion of people

engaged in industry and reduce the number of people engaged in the production of farm products. Even in the United States there are many areas where we want to see as soon as possible a shift in the degree of industrialization. Communities that are now only 40 per cent industrial could, in the course of the next ten years, become perhaps 50 per cent industrial. Similarly, there are many communities in southern Europe, Latin America, and the Pacific countries where that kind of shift would be of tremendous value from the standpoint of raising living standards. For every unit of gain in per capita living standards that a shift to a higher proportion of industrialization would mean in the United States, it would mean proportionately a much greater gain in the countries where industrialization is just begun. One of the difficult problems which we have to face is the need for helping numerous countries shift to increased industrialization without encouraging them to resort to high tariff schedules to accomplish that end.

Fortunately, in many cases the low level of industrialization is not a result of circumstances for which there is no remedy, but a consequence of the scarcity of capital and lack of proper technicians. It should be possible with intelligent effort to help those countries get both. Such growth in industrialization will assure the raw-material countries, which will be exchanging present production for gold, a continued market for their raw materials far into the future.

Some such program as here suggested might be worked out in collaboration with the British, and the democracies of Europe and Latin America, and put into effect boldly long before we come to an armistice. Prob-

ably the English-speaking peoples of the world will have to take the lead in underwriting world prosperity for a generation to come. They must begin now to prove by their actions that they are as interested in winning the peace as they are in winning the war. If this long-term, businesslike purchase of raw materials were working within six months, it would be worth a thousand blueprints at the peace conference. It is one of the ways in which we can build up morale for the struggle ahead. It is one of the ways in which we can build an economic future solid enough to be worth fighting for.

IV

The overthrow of Hitler is only half the battle; we must build a world in which our human and material resources are used to the utmost if we are to win a complete victory. This principle should be fundamental as the world moves to reorganize its affairs. Ways must be found by which the potential abundance of the world can be translated into real wealth and a higher standard of living. Certain minimum standards of food, clothing, and shelter ought to be established, and arrangements ought to be made to guarantee that no one should fall below those standards.

In this country we have already made a start in this direction. Through the food-stamp plan, the cotton-stamp plan, the school-lunch program, the low-cost milk program, and the homemade mattress program, the abundance of the farms is being put to use instead of being allowed to go to waste. Similar programs are in effect in greater or less degree in a number of South

American countries, notably Argentina, Uruguay, Brazil, and Chile. In England, the government is subsidizing consumption of certain foods so as to make sure that the population is as well nourished as possible during the time of stress, and to keep the prices as near as possible to the pre-war level. Among the kinds of food subsidized are flour, bread, meat, tea, oatmeal, milk, and orange juice.

Is it not time to recognize that minimum standards of nutrition are as important for growing children as minimum standards of education? Is it not just as important that children should have sound and healthy bodies as that they should have trained minds? If we can afford \$100 a year to educate a child, can't we afford \$15 or \$20 a year to keep that child physically fit for study?

If there is general recognition of this principle, then vast new markets for the world's production can be opened up. Perhaps the various countries can do still more than they have already done with relief distribution programs based primarily on their own domestic products. In certain instances these could be supplemented with foreign-grown products. For example, we could exchange our pork and lard and flour for South America's tropical fruits and cocoa. In terms of the residual balance, the cost of such a program may be less than the financial loss coming from demoralized raw material markets, needy producers, and hungry consumers.

In the field of food, minimum standards would mean that vastly increased quantities of dairy products, poultry products, meats, fruits, and vegetables would have

to be produced. This would mean a shift from the production of staples such as wheat.

Perhaps the heavily populated countries of Europe can reorganize their own agriculture along those lines. This would mean a higher standard of living for their own people, and would restore to producing countries elsewhere the job of producing the wheat that is needed.

I do not mean to imply that I consider such mechanisms as the food- and cotton-stamp plans the final answer to the problem of assuring an economy of abundance. In that part of the world where democracy and capitalism prevail, the permanent answer lies in finding ways to make our system of production and exchange work more effectively and more consistently. That can be done by removing trade barriers and enlarging markets; by stimulating and guiding investments where they can be productive; by reducing—through appropriate fiscal policy and social security program—the inequalities in incomes, so that a higher and more stable demand for consumers' goods will be attained; by applying advanced techniques and skills to the development of undeveloped areas; by re-equipping our own industrial and transportation system; and by providing to those people in greatest need better housing, schooling, and recreation.

Most people do not want charity. They want paying jobs. They will be able to have paying jobs, with few interruptions, if prices, production, and purchasing power can be held in balance with one another, and the economic machine can be kept running steadily and smoothly. This is the challenge to the leaders of industry, agriculture, labor, and government. It is a chal-

lenge to the highest statesmanship of our own and other nations. Of course there are difficulties and obstacles. Only by recognizing and studying obstacles can they be surmounted. A 'new order' is truly waiting to be created—not the 'new order' which the Nazis talk about and which would cloak the new form of slavery they would impose, but a new order of democracy where security, stability, efficiency, and widely distributed abundance would prevail.

Many persons in the United States are deeply disturbed over the heavy government borrowing and the drastic shifts in our economy made necessary by the defense program. They fear an end of the war almost as much as the war itself, because they believe the return of peace would bring another bad depression. But one of the hopeful signs for the future is the very fact that the possibility of depression is so widely recognized. This increases the chance that action will be taken in time to prevent it or at least cushion the shock. The basis for such action can best be laid now, while the war is still in progress. It must be laid, at least in part, in the plans for expanding and regularizing world trade, world production, world consumption. This is the new frontier, which Americans in the middle of the twentieth century find beckoning them on.

A Tribute to Russia *

By VICE-PRESIDENT HENRY A. WALLACE

From north, south, east and west, Americans have come this day to pay tribute to our Russian ally. It is right that we should do so, because the Russians have thus far lost in the common cause of the United Nations at least 50 per cent more men killed, wounded and missing than all of the rest of the European allies put together. Moreover, they have killed, wounded and captured at least 20 times as many Germans as have the rest of the allies. In all of Russian history, there is no more striking example of courage and willingness to sacrifice than Russia presents today.

This meeting demonstrates just one thing—the desire and the determination of the American people to help Russia and help her now. President Roosevelt has told the Army and Navy and all the other war agencies in terms which cannot possibly be misunderstood that help to Russia comes first—up to the limit of shipping possibilities. The American people are solidly behind President Roosevelt in his decision to give Russia priority number one.

It is no accident that Americans and Russians like each other when they get acquainted. Both peoples were moulded by the vast sweep of a rich continent. Both peoples knew that their future is greater than

* Remarks by the Hon. Henry A. Wallace at the Congress of American-Soviet Friendship, 5 p.m. (E.W.T.) Sunday afternoon, November 8, 1942, Madison Square Garden, New York City, New York, broadcast nationally over the Blue Network.

their past. Both hate sham. When the Russian people burst the shackles of Czarist absolutism, they turned instinctively to the United States for engineering and agricultural guidance. Thanks to the hunger of the Russian people for progress, they were able to learn in 25 years that which had taken us in the United States 100 years to develop.

The first person to sense the eventual significance of Russia and the United States was the French author, Tocqueville, who 107 years ago wrote:

"There are at the present time two great nations in the world which seem to tend towards the same end, although they start from different points. I allude to the Russians and the Americans. . . . Their starting point is different and their courses are not the same, yet each of them seems to be marked by the will of heaven to sway the destinies of half the globe."

Russia and the United States today are far closer than Tocqueville could possibly have imagined when he travelled across the United States in 1835. The continental position of both countries and the need for developing rich resources unmolested from without have caused the peoples of both nations to have a profound hatred of war and a strong love of peace.

We in the United States honor Maxim Litvinov, when we recall how as Foreign Minister of Russia he worked for "collective security." Litvinov, in those days when Hitler was rising to power, wanted to preserve the peace by banding together the non-aggressor nations so they could take a decisive stand against any ruthless nation that might be out for loot. He saw Russia bounded by 14 different nations, many of which were

unfriendly for definite historical reasons. He knew that Germany would use one or more of these nations against Russia when she attacked. Litvinov failed for a time, but now he has come into his own again because he was right.

Russia has had her bitter experience with isolationism. So also has the United States. In 1919 Republicans and Democrats alike sought through a League of Nations to express their belief in the collective security of that day. Taft, Hughes, Hoover, Lowden, and Root all wanted a League. Then isolationism came out of its cave and not only killed any possibility of our entering the League, but made it certain that we would adopt international policies which would make World War No. 2 almost inevitable.

Both Russia and the United States retreated into isolationism to preserve their peace. Both failed. Both have learned their lesson.

Russia and the United States have had a profound effect upon each other. Both are striving for the education, the productivity and the enduring happiness of the common man. The new democracy, the democracy of the common man, includes not only the Bill of Rights, but also economic democracy, ethnic democracy, educational democracy, and democracy in the treatment of the sexes.

The ferment in the world today is such that these various types of democracy must be woven together into a harmonious whole. Millions of Americans are now coming to see that if Pan America and the British Commonwealth are the warp of the new democracy,

then the peoples of Russia and Asia may well become its woof.

Some in the United States believe that we have over-emphasized what might be called political or bill-of-rights democracy. Carried to its extreme form, it leads to rugged individualism, exploitation, impractical emphasis on states' rights, and even to anarchy.

Russia, perceiving some of the abuses of excessive political democracy, has placed strong emphasis on economic democracy. This, carried to an extreme, demands that all power be centered in one man and his bureaucratic helpers.

Somewhere there is a practical balance between economic and political democracy. Russia and the United States both have been working toward this practical middle ground. In present-day Russia, for example, differences in wage income are almost but not quite as great as in the United States. The manager of a factory may be paid ten times as much as the average worker. Outstanding artists, scientists, and writers are usually paid even more than factory managers or political commissars. The chief difference between the economic organization of Russia and that of the United States is that in Russia it is almost impossible to live on income-producing property. The Russian form of state socialism is designed not to get equality of income but to place a maximum incentive on each individual to produce his utmost.

A third kind of democracy, which I call ethnic, is in my opinion vital to the new democracy, the democracy of the common man. Ethnic democracy means merely that the different races and minority groups must be

given equality of economic opportunity. President Roosevelt was guided by principles of ethnic democracy when in June of 1941 he issued an Executive Order prohibiting racial discrimination in the employing of workers by national defense industries. Russia has probably gone further than any other nation in the world in practising ethnic democracy. From the Russians we can learn much, for unfortunately the Anglo-Saxons have had an attitude toward other races which has made them exceedingly unpopular in many parts of the world. We have not sunk to the lunatic level of the Nazi myth of racial superiority, but we have sinned enough to cost us already the blood of tens of thousands of precious lives. Ethnic democracy built from the heart is perhaps the greatest need of the Anglo-Saxon tradition.

The fourth democracy, which has to do with education, is based fundamentally on belief in ethnic democracy. It is because Stalin pushed educational democracy with all the power that he could command that Russia today is able to resist Germany. The Russian people for generations have had a great hunger to learn to read and write, and when Lenin and Stalin gave them the opportunity, they changed in twenty years from a nation which was 90 per cent illiterate to a nation of which nearly 90 per cent are able to read and write. Russia has had a great admiration for the American system of technical education and public libraries. If she can continue during the next twenty years the progress made in the past twenty, she will surpass the United States. If, in the future, Russia comes wholeheartedly into the family of nations, we may expect Russian scientists to make contributions to human wel-

fare which equal those of any nation in the world. In any event, the Russian scientists will most assuredly be doing their best to place the results of science more definitely at the service of the average man and woman. Patents based on Russian scientific work will not be held out of use to benefit international cartels.

With regard to the fifth democracy, the treatment of the sexes, most of us in the United States have felt complacent. It has taken the war experience of Russia to demonstrate the completeness of our failure. The Russian Revolution gave equality of economic opportunity to women. Those who have visited Russia recently say that about 40 per cent of the work in the factories is being done by women. The average woman does about as much work as the average man and is paid as much. Thousands of Russian women are in uniform, either actively fighting or standing guard. We in the United States have not yet in the same way as the Russians called on the tremendous reserve power which is in our women, but before this war is over, we may be forced to give women their opportunity to demonstrate that with proper training they are equal to man in most kinds of work.

The old democracy did not serve as a guarantee of peace. The new democracy in which the people of the United States and Russia are so deeply interested must give us such a guarantee. This new democracy will be neither Communism of the old-fashioned internationalist type nor democracy of the old-fashioned isolationist sort. Willingness to support world organization to maintain world peace by justice implemented by force is fundamental to the democracy of the common man in

these days of airplanes. Fortunately, the airplanes, which make it necessary to organize the world for peace, also furnish the means of maintaining peace. When this war comes to an end, the United Nations will have such an overwhelming superiority in air power that we shall be able speedily to enforce any mandate whenever the United Nations may have arrived at a judgment based on international law.

The first article in the international law of the future is undoubtedly the United Nations' Charter. The United Nations' Charter includes the Atlantic Charter and there is little reason why it should longer be called the "Atlantic Charter" in view of the fact that the broader instrument has been validated by 30 nations.

This United Nations' Charter has in it an international bill of rights and certain economic guarantees of international peace. These must and will be made more specific. There must be an international bank and an international TVA, based on projects which are self-liquidating at low rates of interest.

In this connection, I would like to refer to a conversation with Molotoff, when he was here last spring. Thinking of the unemployment and misery which might so easily follow this war, I spoke of the need for productive public works programs which would stir the imagination of all the peoples of the world and suggested as a starter a combined highway and airway from southern South America across the United States, Canada, and Alaska, into Siberia and on to Europe with feeder highways and airways from China, India, and the Middle East. Molotoff's first reaction was, "No one

nation can do it by itself." Then he said, "You and I will live to see the day."

The new democracy by definition abhors imperialism. But by definition also, it is internationally minded and supremely interested in raising the productivity, and therefore the standard of living, of all the peoples of the world. First comes transportation and this is followed by improved agriculture, industrialization and rural electrification. The big planes and skilled pilots which will be ours when the war comes to an end will lead us into a most remarkable future as surely as day follows night. We can make it a future of new democracy based on peace. As Molotoff so clearly indicated, this brave, free world of the future cannot be created by the United States and Russia alone.

Undoubtedly China will have a strong influence on the world which will come out of this war and in exerting this influence it is quite possible that the principles of Sun Yat-sen will prove to be as significant as those of any other modern statesman. The British Commonwealth, England herself, the democracies of north-west Europe, Latin America, and in fact all of the United Nations, have a very important role to play. But in order that the United Nations may effectively serve the world, it is vital that the United States and Russia be in accord as to the fundamentals of an enduring peace based on the aspirations of the common man. I am here this afternoon to say that it is my belief that the American and Russian people can and will throw their influence on the side of building a new democracy which will be the hope of all the world.

Memorial Day Address *

By SUMNER WELLES, Under Secretary of State

Today, as our Nation faces the gravest danger it has ever confronted since it gained its independence, the American people are once more meeting together in every State of the Union to commemorate the observance of Memorial Day.

In the elm-shaded churchyards of the New England hills, in the more newly consecrated burial places of the West, here in the quiet century-old cemeteries of the South, men and women throughout the land are now paying tribute to the memories of those who have made the ultimate sacrifice for their country and for their fellow men.

Eighty years ago our people were engaged in a fratricidal war between the States. In the fires of that devastating struggle was forged the great assurance that within the boundaries of the United States men were and would remain free. The lives of those who died in that contest were not laid down in vain.

Forty-four years ago the United States went to war to help the gallant people of Cuba free themselves from the imposition by a nation of the Old World of a brutal tyranny which could not be tolerated in a New World dedicated to the cause of liberty. Through our victory in that war there was wrought a lasting safeguard to the independence of the republics of the Western Hemi-

* Delivered at Arlington National Amphitheater, May 30, 1942.

sphere. Our citizens who then gave up their lives did not do so in vain.

Twenty-five years ago the United States declared war upon Germany. Our people went to war because of their knowledge that the domination of the world by German militarism would imperil the continuation of their national existence.

We won that victory. Ninety thousand of our fellow Americans died in that great holocaust in order to win that victory. They died firm in the belief that the gift of their lives which they offered their country would be utilized by their countrymen as they had been promised it would be—to insure beyond doubt the future safety of the United States through the creation of that kind of world in which a peaceful democracy such as ours could live in happiness and in security.

These ninety thousand dead, buried here on the slopes of Arlington and in the fields of France where they fell in battle, fulfilled their share of the bargain struck. Can we, the living, say as much? Can we truly say on this Memorial Day that we have done what we as a nation could have done to keep faith with them and to prevent their sacrifice from being made in vain?

The people of the United States were offered at the conclusion of the last war the realization of a great vision. They were offered the opportunity of sharing in the assumption of responsibility for the maintenance of peace in the world by participating in an international organization designed to prevent and to quell the outbreak of war. That opportunity they rejected. They rejected it in part because of the human tendency after a great upsurge of emotional idealism to seek the relapse

into what was once termed "normalcy." They rejected it because of partisan politics. They rejected it because of the false propaganda, widely spread, that by our participation in a world order we would incur the danger of war rather than avoid it. They rejected it because of unenlightened selfishness.

At the dawn of the nineteenth century an English poet wrote of his own land:

She is a fen
Of stagnant waters: altar, sword, and pen,
Fireside, the heroic wealth of hall and bower
Have forfeited their ancient dower
Of inward happiness. We are selfish men.

In 1920 and in the succeeding years we as a nation not only plumbed the depths of material selfishness but we were unbelievably blind. We were blind to what constituted our own enlightened self-interest, and we therefore refused to see that by undertaking a measure of responsibility in maintaining world order, with the immediate commitments which that might involve, we were insuring our people and our democratic ideals against the perils of an unforeseeable future, and we were safeguarding our children and our children's children against having to incur the same sacrifices as those forced upon their fathers. Who can today compare the cost in life or treasure which we might have had to contribute towards the stabilization of a world order during its formative years after 1919 with the prospective loss in lives and the lowering of living standards which will result from the supreme struggle in which we are now engaged.

During the first century of our independence our

forefathers were occupying and developing a continent. The American pioneer was pushing ever westward across the Alleghenies into the fertile Ohio Valley, the Mississippi and Missouri country, the Southwest, and finally to the Pacific Coast. The shock of disaster elsewhere in the world was hardly felt; relief from recurring depressions could always be found by expanding our frontiers, by opening up new lands and new industries to supply the needs of our rapidly expanding population. Thus cushioned against the impact of events abroad, the American standard of living steadily improved and became the hope of down-trodden peoples of other lands.

Protected by two great oceans to the east and to the west, with no enemies to the north or to the south, the nineteenth century imbued into the minds of our people the belief that in their isolation from the rest of the world lay their safety.

But the oceans shrank with the development of maritime communications, and the security which we enjoyed by reason of our friendly neighbors vanished with the growth of aviation.

And even in our earlier days our industries became increasingly dependent upon raw materials imported from abroad; their products were sold increasingly in the markets of the Old World. Our urban industrial areas in the East became more and more dependent on our agricultural and mining areas in the West. All became increasingly dependent on world markets and world sources of supply.

With the close of the first World War the period of our isolation had ended. Neither from the standpoint

of our physical security nor from the standpoint of our material well-being could we any more remain isolated.

But, as if by their fiat they could turn back the tides of accomplished fact, our leaders and the great majority of our people in those post-war years deliberately returned to the provincial policies and standards of an earlier day, thinking that because these had served their purpose in the past they could do so again in a new and in a changed world.

And now we are engaged in the greatest war which mankind has known. We are reaping the bitter fruit of our own folly and of our own lack of vision. We are paying dearly as well for the lack of statesmanship and for the crass errors of omission and of commission, so tragically evidenced in the policies of those other nations which have had their full share of responsibility for the conduct of human affairs during the past generation.

What can we now do to rectify the mistakes of these past two decades?

The immediate answer is self-evident. We must utterly and finally crush the evil men and the iniquitous systems which they have devised that are today menacing our existence and that of free men and women throughout the earth. There can be no compromise. There can be no respite until the victory is won. We are faced by desperate and powerful antagonists. To win the fight requires every ounce of driving energy, every resource and initiative, every sacrifice, and every instinct of devotion which each and every American citizen possesses. None of us can afford to think of ourselves; none of us can dare to do less than

his full part in the common effort. Our liberty, our Christian faith, our life as a free people are at stake. Those who indulge themselves in false optimism, those who believe that the peoples who are fighting with us for our common cause should relieve us of our due share of sacrifice, those who are reluctant to give their all in this struggle for the survival on the earth of what is fine and decent must be regarded as enemies of the American people.

Now more than ever before must we keep the faith with those who lie sleeping in this hallowed ground—and with those who now at this very hour are dying for the cause and for the land they love.

And after we win the victory—and we will—what then? Will the people of the United States then make certain that those who have died that we may live as free men and women shall not have died in vain?

I believe that in such case the voice of those who are doing the fighting and the voice of those who are producing the arms with which we fight must be heard and must be heeded.

And I believe that these voices of the men who will make our victory possible will demand that justice be done inexorably and swiftly to those individuals, groups, or peoples, as the case may be, that can truly be held accountable for the stupendous catastrophe into which they have plunged the human race. But I believe they will likewise wish to make certain that no element in any nation shall be forced to atone vicariously for crimes for which it is not responsible and that no people shall be forced to look forward to endless years of want and of starvation.

I believe they will require that the victorious nations, joined with the United States, undertake forthwith during the period of the armistice the disarmament of all nations, as set forth in the Atlantic Charter, which "may threaten aggression outside of their frontiers."

I believe they will insist that the United Nations undertake the maintenance of an international police power in the years after the war to insure freedom from fear to peace-loving peoples until there is established that permanent system of general security promised by the Atlantic Charter.

Finally, I believe they will demand that the United Nations become the nucleus of a world organization of the future to determine the final terms of a just, an honest, and a durable peace to be entered into after the passing of the period of social and economic chaos which will come inevitably upon the termination of the present war and after the completion of the initial and gigantic task of relief, of reconstruction, and of rehabilitation which will confront the United Nations at the time of the armistice.

This is in very truth a people's war. It is a war which cannot be regarded as won until the fundamental rights of the peoples of the earth are secured. In no other manner can a true peace be achieved.

In the pre-war world large numbers of people were unemployed; the living standards of millions of people were pitifully low; it was a world in which nations were classified as "haves" and "have nots," with all that these words imply in terms of inequity and hatred.

The pre-war world was one in which small, vociferous, and privileged minorities in each country felt that

they could not gain sufficient profits if they faced competition from abroad. Even this country with its rich natural resources, its vast economic strength, a population whose genius for efficient production enabled us to export the finest products in the world at low cost and at the same time to maintain the highest wages—a country whose competitive strength was felt in the markets of the world—even such a nation was long dominated by its minority interests who sought to destroy international trade in order to avoid facing foreign competition.

They not only sought to do so but for long years following the first World War largely succeeded in doing so. The destruction of international trade by special minority interests in this and in other countries brought ruin to their fellow citizens by destroying an essential element upon which the national prosperity in each country in large measure depended. It helped to pave the way, through the impoverishment and distress of the people, for militarism and dictatorship. Can the democracies of the world again afford to permit national policies to be dictated by self-seeking minorities of special privilege?

The problem which will confront us when the years of the post-war period are reached is not primarily one of production, for the world can readily produce what mankind requires. The problem is rather one of distribution and purchasing power, of providing the mechanism whereby what the world produces may be fairly distributed among the nations of the world, and of providing the means whereby the people of the world may obtain the world's goods and services. Your Govern-

ment has already taken steps to obtain the support and active co-operation of others of the United Nations in this great task, a task which in every sense of the term is a new frontier—a frontier of limitless expanse—the frontier of human welfare.

When the war ends, with the resultant exhaustion which will then beset so many of the nations who are joined with us, only the United States will have the strength and the resources to lead the world out of the slough in which it has struggled so long, to lead the way toward a world order in which there can be freedom from want. In seeking this end we will of course respect the right of all peoples to determine for themselves the type of internal economic organization which is best suited to their circumstances. But I believe that here in our own country we will continue to find the best expression for our own and the general good under a system which will give the greatest incentive and opportunity for individual enterprise. It is in such an environment that our citizens have made this country strong and great. Given sound national policies directed toward the benefit of the majority and not of the minority and real security and equality of opportunity for all, reliance on the ingenuity, initiative, and enterprise of our citizens rather than on any form of bureaucratic management will in the future best assure the liberties and promote the material welfare of our people.

In taking thought of our future opportunities we surely must undertake to preserve the advantages we have gained in the past. I cannot believe the peoples of the United States and of the Western Hemisphere will ever relinquish the inter-American system they have

built up. Based as it is on sovereign equality, on liberty, on peace, and on joint resistance to aggression, it constitutes the only example in the world today of a regional federation of free and independent peoples. It lightens the darkness of our anarchic world. It should constitute a cornerstone in the world structure of the future.

If this war is in fact a war for the liberation of peoples, it must assure the sovereign equality of peoples throughout the world as well as in the world of the Americas. Our victory must bring in its train the liberation of all peoples. Discrimination between peoples because of their race, creed, or color must be abolished. The age of imperialism is ended. The right of a people to their freedom must be recognized as the civilized world long since recognized the right of an individual to his personal freedom. The principles of the Atlantic Charter must be guaranteed to the world as a whole—in all oceans and in all continents.

And so in the fullness of God's time when the victory is won the people of the United States will once more be afforded the opportunity to play their part in the determination of the kind of world in which they will live. With courage and with vision they can yet secure the future safety of their country and of its free institutions and help the nations of the earth back into the paths of peace.

Then on some future Memorial Day the American people, as they mark the graves of those who died in battle for their country in these last two World Wars, can at last truly say: "Sleep on in quiet and in peace;

the victory you made it possible for us to win has now been placed at the service of your country and of humanity; your sacrifice has not been made in vain."

Winning the War After the War *

By MILO PERKINS, *Executive Director of the Board of Economic Warfare.*

Our country is settling down to the grim business of smashing the Axis powers. We are beginning to realize that the national problem is an individual problem. There is a growing sense of personal responsibility for winning this war. Total victory cannot be left to the other fellow to work out in his own backyard. Each of us must contribute personally and with a whole heart to the utter defeat of our enemies. That individual determination and effort are all that stand between us and slavery. They are so important that nothing else matters for now. This is as it must be but there is deeper, more significant meaning to this conflict.

We are engaged in a struggle that transcends the present war. This is a long, long fight to make a mass-production economy work. The battle started when machines became important in the lives of men. It should be over within the generation following this conflict. The battle will be won when we have built up mass-consumption to a point where markets can absorb the

* Excerpts from the commencement address of Milo Perkins, Executive Director, Board of Economic Warfare, before the graduating class of Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, Pennsylvania, May 25, 1942.

output of our mass-production industries running at top speed. Then, so far as our physical needs are concerned, life can become a journey to be enjoyed rather than a battle to be fought.

Our minds are now creating neat little time compartments labeled pre-war, war and post-war but these are like the labels of childhood, youth and manhood to the individual who lives through them. This is a single and continuous struggle to achieve one goal. Complete victory will not be won until there is a full and increasing use of the world's resources to lift living standards from one end of this planet to the other. The twentieth century is a time set apart for the winning of this total triumph. Humanity is not going back to the wolf stage.

Men lost their battle to avoid this war. It was lost primarily because the world was unable to distribute what it had learned how to produce. This failure was as true of trade within countries as it was of trade between countries. The nightmare of under-consumption was the black plague of the pre-war era. We put up with a civilization which was commodity-rich but consumption-poor too long to avert the present catastrophe.

Today we realize as we never did in peace-time how important an all-out production effort is to our national strength. We are going at it like men killing snakes. We are building the machines with which to wipe the tyrants from the face of the earth. Our young men are fighting like tigers to keep this a free world.

Their courage will bring us final military victory at the end of which we shall have the greatest production of raw materials, the greatest industrial plant and the greatest number of skilled workers in all history. All

this will exist side by side with intense want throughout every land. The bridging of that gap will present the greatest challenge any generation of young people ever faced.

Better than half of our industrial output at the end of this war will be going to one customer—our own government. The business will exceed 70 billion dollars a year. Any attempt to stop that purchasing power abruptly would result in complete bankruptcy. There must be a gradual and sensible unwinding. Government must encourage business to regain its peace-time markets as fast as it can and business must encourage government to taper off its activities slowly enough to keep production going full blast. The heavy demand for civilian goods in the immediate post-war period will make it easier to accomplish this transition.

Capital investment in heavy goods for reconstruction must replace capital investment in armaments at a rate adequate to maintain full employment. Any wavering in this course will bring on a tragedy worse than war. We can and we should have open discussion about the various methods of using our resources to the utmost. But that is quite different from questioning the absolute necessity of their full utilization. Failure to use those resources to the utmost would be the one sure way to lose the way of life for which our sons are now willing and ready to die.

Full blast production for a gradually rising standard of living will be as necessary to win the peace as all-out production now is to win the war. It will be physically possible. Our number one post-war job will be to make

it fiscally possible. If we can do that, private enterprise will enter upon an era of unparalleled activity.

The greatest untapped markets industrial capitalism has ever known will open up before us. Their development will be the one hope for our profit system. Industrial capitalism cannot survive without those markets. Of course it won't be easy. There will be complicated distribution problems to be worked out. There will be the problem of how to get purchasing power into the hands of potential customers so they can become real customers. There will be the problem of how to develop a peace-time job for every displaced worker in our armament industries. It will be hard but it won't be any tougher than winning this war.

The plain people of this earth know what they want in the post-war period. Above all else they want to be *wanted*; they want a chance to work and be useful. They want an income which will give them enough food and clothing and shelter and medical care to drive the fear of want from the family fireside. And they want these simple things within a society that guarantees their civil liberties.

The plain people will be understanding about the problems of readjustment. They will work hard for all this and they will walk any reasonable roads to these ends. But the chains of the ages have snapped. The one thing they won't do is to take "no" for a final answer to their cry for full employment. Not after all this suffering; not when they see themselves surrounded later on by too much of what they need most and yet might not be able to get. Idleness, be it of men or money or

machines, will be the one unforgivable sin of the post-war world.

"But," some people ask, "*how* are we going to do all this?" The question sounds reasonable enough at first glance. Actually, however, only the timid ask it. The courageous ask, "*which* method do you think will work best?" In the first case, the questioner really doubts that much *can* be done to make the world work any better in the future than it worked in the past. In the second case, that hurdle has already been cleared, and the concern is with the most efficient and businesslike ways of getting the job done. It makes an enormous difference. The "how" people are afraid of the future. The "which" people welcome it! And make no mistake about it, the future belongs to them.

I could talk to you about ways of financing housing in the post-war world. I could talk to you about an imaginative use of long-term credits to industrialize the backward areas of three continents. I could tell you that if the peoples of Asia alone earned an extra penny a day it would open up a new market of four billion dollars a year for somebody. I could talk to you about what a decent diet for everybody would mean to farm income throughout every country. We could talk for hours about these things. As soon as the political shape of things to come in this world gets clearer, workable methods and programs must be considered in great detail.

But there will be time for that. Hundreds of preliminary blueprints for economic readjustments in the post-war world already have been drawn. We are not short on blueprints. What we are short on is faith in

the future of our own country. Let's not put the cart before the horse. What we need first is a new buoyancy which comes only to those who know there is a solid basis upon which to welcome tomorrow with a sense of adventure.

Once that is re-awakened in us as a whole people, a thousand and one individuals will come forward with a thousand and one business-like projects for making a mass production economy work. The magnificent fight of Secretary Hull for a freer flow of goods in this world is going to be won. Every farmer, every worker and every business man will be needed to get the job done. Personal responsibility for economic victory at the end of this conflict will be as necessary as personal responsibility for military victory is today.

That's the way we conquered the West and that's the way we built our magnificent industrial empire. That's the way we're going at the winning of this war and that's the way we're going to win the peace. When a whole people is dedicated to one goal no obstacle on earth can stand against the singleness of purpose. These are times of great crisis but we needn't be terrified by them. The Chinese write the word crisis with two characters, one of which means "danger" and the other "opportunity." That's worth remembering.

When the history of this period is written a couple of centuries from now, the present war may be treated as an incident of adjustment to the scientific realities of our times. In every civilization of the past, bar none, if men took the most that it was possible to produce and divided it among all who were alive to share it, the answer was always a miserable standard of living.

Within your lifetime and mine, however, men have entered an era dominated by the machine and the test-tube. If we take all that can be produced at the end of this war and divide it among the people who will then be alive to share it, we shall be within reach of a very good standard of living for the first time in all history. That will be the most important material thing that's happened to the human race since the discovery of fire and the invention of the wheel.

The job of the future will be to build up a mass consumption great enough to use this mass production. That will require a bold and daring use of long term credits by every enlightened government of the world. Governments must enter fields where private finance cannot enter without assuming risks that are too great to take with other people's money. By that very act, however, the area of private investment will be broader and safer than it was in the last two decades. A world at work at decent wages is a world of economic stability. Idleness is the greatest of all threats to confidence.

Of course there are changes ahead but this evolutionary progress need not destroy our system of private enterprise. On the contrary, those changes can provide an environment in which industrial capitalism can be strengthened enormously. We have it in us to measure up to this job of maintaining full employment. The war is toughening us for the greatest conquest men have ever faced—the conquest of backwardness and unnecessary poverty. We are learning to live like men who are conquerors to the core.

What does all this mean to us as individuals? It means that our personal fortunes will be tied to what happens

to groups of other men in this world as those fortunes never were in the past. It means that what today does to us as individuals is probably not very important. What is important is what we do with tomorrow by way of keeping the whole world at work on all-out production for a century to come. If we can lose ourselves wholeheartedly in that job, we shall find personal completeness as men have never found it before.

If we cannot, the tides of life will leave us to one side; we shall become isolated in a world where men are growing closer to each other.

After all, the only lasting security for any of us lies in moving constantly forward. Those who have won to this understanding welcome a changing future every morning of their lives—and love it. They alone have the competence to lead us through the rest of this dramatic epoch upon which the world has now entered.

America's Real Task *

By WENDELL L. WILLKIE, *titular head of the Republican Party.*

You young men are about to enter into the affairs of a world torn by a hideous war. Large portions of it are dominated by intolerance and hate. An adventurer still rules the greater part of Europe as a military overlord, and the octopus of Japan, grown more menacing by

* The address of Wendell L. Willkie, delivered at the 147th Commencement of Union College, Schenectady, New York, Monday morning, May 11, 1942. Mr. Willkie was Honorary Chancellor of Union College for 1942.

feeding in fresh waters, extends its tentacles over the rich resources of the Far East.

Yet it was only a short time ago—less than a quarter of a century—that the democratic nations, including our own, gained an outstanding victory over the forces of conquest and aggression then led by Imperial Germany. We believed that we had attained peace for our time, at least. We believed that for a long period to come the world would not again be plunged into one of those appalling, devastating, all-embracing conflicts. Somewhere along the line—and certainly we cannot escape our share of the responsibility—there has been a shocking failure to uphold and secure the world peace that had been won at such great cost and sacrifice. You as young men, must analyse that failure if this present war is to be anything more than just another season of blood-letting; if a prostrate civilization is to be lifted up and given purpose and meaning, beyond merely the restoration of its vigor for renewed combat. That is all we did in the twenty-one year period between 1918 and 1939. You must not repeat our mistakes.

Our own history furnishes, I believe, the clue to our failure. One of its most obvious weaknesses in the light of what is going on today, is the lack of any continuity in our foreign policy. Neither major party can claim to have pursued a stable or consistent program of international co-operation even during the relatively brief period of the last forty-five years. Each has had its season of world outlook—sometimes an imperialistic one—and each its season of strict isolationism, the Congressional leadership of the party out of power usually

blindly opposing the program of the party in power, whatever it might be.

For years the intellectual leadership in both parties has recognized that if peace, economic prosperity and liberty itself were to continue in this world, the nations of the world must find a method of economic stabilization and co-operative effort.

These aspirations at the end of the First World War, under the leadership of Woodrow Wilson, produced a concrete program of international co-operation intended to safeguard all nations against military aggression, to protect racial minorities and to give the oncoming generation some confidence that it could go about its affairs without a return of the disrupting and blighting scourge of war. Whatever we may think about the details of that program, it was definite, affirmative action for world peace. We cannot state positively just how effective it might have proved, had the United States extended to it support, influence and active participation.

But we do know that we tried the opposite course and found it altogether futile. We entered into an era of strictest detachment from world affairs. Many of our public leaders, Democratic and Republican, went about the country proclaiming that we had been tricked into the last war, that our ideals had been betrayed, that never again should we allow ourselves to become entangled in world politics which would inevitably bring about another armed outbreak. We were blessed with natural barriers, they maintained, and need not concern ourselves with the complicated and unsavory affairs of an old world beyond our borders. As a result, along

with all the other democratic nations, we did nothing when Japan invaded Manchuria, though our own Secretary of State, Henry L. Stimson, expressed his outrage; we with the other democracies sat by while Italy wantonly invaded Ethiopia and we let Hitler enter the Rhineland without even a protest.

We shut ourselves away from world trade by excessive tariff barriers. We washed our hands of the continent of Europe and displayed no interest in its fate while Germany re-armed. We torpedoed the London Economic Conference when the European democracies, with France lagging in the rear, were just beginning to recover from the economic depression that had sapped their vitality, and when the instability of foreign exchange remained the principal obstacle to full revival. And in so doing, we sacrificed a magnificent opportunity for leadership in strengthening and rehabilitating the democratic nations, in fortifying them against assault by the forces of aggression which at that very moment were beginning to gather.

Even as late as 1938, we concentrated on domestic reform.

All of this happened when you were too young to be concerned with the nature of our leadership. The responsibility for it does not attach solely to any political party. For neither major party stood consistently and conclusively before the American public as either the party of world outlook or the party of isolation. If we were to say that Republican leadership destroyed the League of Nations in 1920, we must add that it was Democratic leadership that broke up the London Economic Conference in 1933.

I was a believer in the League. Without, at this time, however, arguing either for or against the provisions of the League plans, I should like to point out to you the steps leading to its defeat here in the United States. For that fight furnishes a perfect example of the type of leadership we must avoid in this country if we are ever going to fulfill our responsibilities as a nation that believes in a free world, a just world, a world at peace.

President Wilson negotiated the peace proposals at Versailles including the covenant of the League. Upon his return the treaty and the covenant were submitted to the United States Senate for ratification. And there arose one of the most dramatic episodes in American history. I cannot here trace the detail of that fight which resulted in rejection on the part of the United States of world leadership. Let me, however, try to give you the broad outlines of the picture.

First, as to the Senate group, the so-called "batallion of death," the "irreconcilables," or the "bitter-enders." Here was a faction that had no party complexion. In its leadership the name of the democratic orator, James A. Reed, occupies as conspicuous a position as that of the Republican, Borah. At the other extreme was the uncompromising war president, Woodrow Wilson, who insisted on the treaty with every "i" dotted and every "t" crossed. Between them were the reservationists, of various complexions and opinions, and of both Republican and Democratic affiliation.

We do not know today, and perhaps we never shall know, whether the Republican leader of the Senate, Henry Cabot Lodge, whose name we now associate with the defeat of the League, truly wanted the League

adopted with safeguarding reservations, or whether he employed the reservations to kill the League. Many may have convictions on this point, but I doubt that anyone has conclusive knowledge. Even his close friends and members of his family have reported contrary opinions on the subject.

But we do know that when this question passed from the Senate to the two great political conventions of 1920, neither of them stood altogether for or against the Treaty as it had been brought home by the President. The Democratic Convention in its platform did not oppose reservations. The Republican Platform adopted a compromise plank which was broad enough to accommodate those of any viewpoint respecting the particular Woodrow Wilson covenant. There were many firm supporters of the League in the Republican ranks. They found the platform altogether ample to give them standing room, while the anti-League delegates found safe footing there too.

Forgive me if I rehearse this old story in too great detail. The point I want to make for you young men today is that the American people were altogether confused about the treaty issue and about the position of the respective parties on it. Many of their leaders talked two ways.

The platforms were ambiguous; the parties had no consistent historical position about the co-operation of the United States with other nations. The confusion was doubled by the attitude of the Republican candidate, Warren Harding. There was no doubt that Cox's position on the Democratic ticket was a fairly definite support of the Wilson Treaty, though his party plat-

form left open the possibility of reservations and many of the Democratic leaders were openly in opposition. But no one was certain whether Harding was merely pulling his punches against the League or whether he intended to support it aggressively upon election, in a modified form. In private conversation, he gave each man the answer he wanted and of his speeches, the Republican National Committeeman from California, Mr. Chester H. Rowell, said:

One half of the speeches were for the League of Nations if you read them hastily, but if you read them with care, every word of them could have been read critically as against the League of Nations. The other half were violent speeches against the League of Nations if you read them carelessly, but if you read them critically every one of them could be interpreted as in favor of the League of Nations.

It was not until after the election returns were in, that Harding spoke frankly of the League as "now deceased."

I am satisfied that the American people never deliberately and intentionally turned their backs on a program for international co-operation in an organization for maintaining world peace. Possibly they would have preferred changes in the precise Versailles covenant, but not complete aloofness from the efforts of other nations. They were betrayed by leaders without convictions who were thinking in terms of group vote catching.

I do not want to see that same thing happen again. If our isolation after the last war was a contributing factor to the present war and to the economic instability of the past twenty years—and it seems plain that it was

—a withdrawal from the problems and responsibilities of the World after this war would be sheer disaster. Even our relative geographical isolation no longer exists.

At the end of the last war, not a single plane had flown across the Atlantic. Today, that ocean is a mere ribbon, with airplanes making regular scheduled flights. The Pacific is only a slightly wider ribbon in the ocean of the air, and Europe and Asia are at our very doorstep.

You are citizens now and it will be your responsibility to defend your country not only with your guns but by your votes. The men elected to public office in the next year or two may well be holding their offices during the making of the peace. As after the last war, those in Congress will determine the legislation affecting that peace. Those in other high offices will profoundly affect the attitude of their respective parties toward it. As citizens who may be called on to give your very lives to preserve your country's freedom, for God's sake elect to important office men who will not make a mockery of that sacrifice. Make sure that you choose leaders who have principles and the courage to state them plainly. Not men who examine each shift of sentiment and watch the polls of public opinion to learn where they stand. I beg to you, vote for straight-out men—not wobblers. This is no time for ambiguity.

I am confident as I stand here now, that the sentiment in every city and every town and in almost every homestead of this entire land, is that when we have won this war—and by that I mean when we have completely subdued those whose will and practice would be to en-

slave the world—when we have thus freed ourselves from threat of slavery and many millions from its very bonds—we have only cleared the way for our real task.

We must then use the full force of our influence and enlightenment as a nation, to plan and establish continuing agencies under which a new world may develop—a world worth the fight and the sacrifice we have made for it.

For America must choose one of three courses after this war: narrow isolationism which inevitably means the loss of our own liberty; international imperialism which means the sacrifice of some other nation's liberty; or the creation of a world in which there shall be an equality of opportunity for every race and every nation.

Report to the People *

By WENDELL L. WILLKIE

I believe that in a military sense we can win this war. I believe we have the resources, the manpower and the courage to do so. But a victory from a military standpoint, as such, will not be enough.

Now, I have a son in the service, as so many of you have. And when I set this boy of mine against the background of what I have seen all over the world, I am absolutely positive that a military victory will not be enough. The total defeat of the Japanese war lords and the total crushing of the German army could not in

* Mr. Wendell L. Willkie's report to the people, Oct. 26, 1942, on the completion of his trip around the world.

themselves solve the problems of this great, tumultuous earth. We must fight our way through not alone to the destruction of our enemies but to a new world idea. We must win the peace.

But to win that peace three things seem to me necessary—first, we must plan now for peace on a global basis; second, the world must be free, economically and politically, for nations and for men that peace may exist in it; third, America must play an active, a constructive part in freeing it and keeping its peace.

When I say that peace must be planned on a global basis, I mean quite literally that it must embrace the earth. Continents and oceans are plainly only parts of a whole, seen, as I have just seen them, from the air. Russia and China, Egypt, Syria and Turkey, Iraq and Iran are also parts. And it is inescapable that there can be no peace for any part of the world unless the foundations of peace are made secure throughout all the parts of the world.

When I say that in order to have peace this world must be free, I am only reporting that a great process has started which no man—certainly not Hitler—can stop. Men and women all over the world are on the march, physically, intellectually and spiritually. After centuries of ignorant and dull compliance hundreds of millions of people in Eastern Europe and Asia have opened the books. Old fears no longer frighten them. They are no longer willing to be Eastern slaves for Western profits. They are beginning to know that men's welfare throughout the world is interdependent. They are resolved, as we must be, that there is no more place for imperialism within their own society than in the so-

ciety of nations. The big house on the hill surrounded by mud huts has lost its awesome charm.

Our Western world and our presumed supremacy are now on trial. Our boasting and our big talk leave Asia cold. Men and women in Russia and China and in the Middle East are conscious now of their own potential strength. They are coming to know that many of the decisions about the future of the world lie in their hands. And they intend that these decisions shall leave the peoples of each nation free from foreign domination, free for economic, social and spiritual growth.

Finally, when I say that this world demands the full participation of a self-confident America, I am only passing on an invitation which these people of the East have given us. They would like the United States to be one of their partners in this grand adventure. They want us to join them in creating a new society, global in scope, free alike of the economic injustices of the West and the political malpractices of the East. But as a partner in that great new combination they want us neither hesitant, incompetent nor afraid. They want a partner who will not hesitate to speak out for the correction of injustice anywhere in the world.

Our allies in the East know that we intend to pour out our resources in this war. But they expect us now—not after the war—to use the enormous power of our giving to promote liberty and justice. Other peoples, not yet fighting, are waiting no less eagerly for us to accept the most challenging opportunity of all history—the chance to help create a new society in which men and women the globe around can live and grow invigorated by freedom.

INDEX

- Abyssinia, *see* Ethiopia
 Abyssinian campaign, 21
 Acheson, Dean, 77
 Acropolis, 103
 Adriatic Sea, 136, 192
 Aegan Sea, 136
 Africa, 21-22, 91, 107
 Aggrandizement, territorial, 9, 49
 Aggression, 10, 15, 16, 19, 24, 34, 46, 50, 51, 56, 63, 92, 93, 102, 106, 116, 117, 132, 133, 134, 135, 148, 164, 190, 191, 210, 243, 246, 256
 Alaska, 235
 Albania, 132
 Alleghenies, 240
 America, 59, 72, 137, 138, 139, 140, 173, 209. *See also* North America, South America, Pan America, Western Hemisphere
 American Department of Commerce, 21
 "Anglo-American Food Committee," 165
 Antonescu, 67
 Appeasement, 87
 Argentina, 63, 194, 219, 220, 226
 Armaments, 10, 71, 93, 131
 Asia, 32, 71, 72, 107, 119, 159, 165, 184-190, 232, 251, 261, 263, 264
 Athens, 95
 Atlantic Charter, 9-10, 13, 15, 22, 76, 78, 84, 85, 90, 93, 99, 100, 102, 105, 145, 156, 158, 161, 171, 189, 201, 215, 219, 235, 243, 246
Atlantic Monthly, The, 24, 211
 Australia, 63, 180, 194, 219, 220
 Austria, 39, 40-41, 131, 193, 214
 Authoritarianism, 25, 40, 41
 Axis Powers, 49, 93, 101, 132, 141, 184, 186, 187, 189, 247
 Bacon, Roger, 37
 Balkan Entente, 100-102
 Balkan Union, 101
 Balkans, The, 100-102, 133, 135
 Baltic Sea, 135, 136, 192
 Batavia, 185
 Belgium, 36, 173; and Atlantic Charter, 13, 15; Colonial Empire, 11, 21-23; democracy in, 13-14; economic future of, 11, 19-21; in First World War, 11-12, 15; frontiers, 11; indemnities, 11-13; independence, 11, 13, 23; and League of Nations, 16-17; war aims, 11, 23
 Benedict XV, 15
 Beneš, Dr., 38
 Bergen, 170
 Berlin, 61, 66, 191; Act of, 22
 Bismarck, 38
 Board of Economic Warfare, 247
 Bohemia, 35, 38
 Bor, 133
 Borah, 258
 Boundaries, *see* Frontiers
 Brazil, 226
 British Commonwealth, 51, 65, 72, 175, 231, 236
 British Dominions, 58, 59, 219
 British Empire, 19, 20, 51, 56, 58, 67, 70, 72-73, 148, 214, 219
 Buddha, 119

- Bulgaria, 101, 102, 193
Bulletins from Britain, 61, 85
 Byelorussians, 209
- California, 260
 Canada, 63, 194, 214, 219, 220
 235
 Canterbury, Archbishop of, 37
 Čapek, Karel, 37
 Cassin, René, 48-52
 Cauwelaert, Frans J. Van, 11-23
 Central Europe, 39, 40, 131, 192
 Chadbourne sugar arrangement,
 218
 Chiang Kai-shek, Mme., 24-34
 Chile, 226
 China, 60, 65, 72, 104, 116, 141,
 185, 188, 235, 236, 263, 264;
 agricultural prosperity, 26; de-
 mocracy in, 28-33; exploitation
 of, 25, 26; representative govt.,
 30, 32-33
 Christ, 28, 199
Christian Science Monitor, *The*,
 95
 Chungking, 70
 Churchill, Winston, 9-10, 13, 48,
 50, 51, 58, 153, 215, 216, 219
 "Combined Chiefs of Staff," 165,
 166
 "Combined Food Board," 165
 "Combined Production and Re-
 sources Board," 164, 165
 "Combined Raw Materials Board,"
 164, 165
 "Combined Shipping Adjustment
 Board," 165
 Communism, 25, 29, 132, 202, 234
 Congo, Belgian, 21-23
 Congress, U. S., 55, 210, 258-260,
 261-262. *See also* Senate, U. S.
 Constitution: American, 64; Bel-
 gian, 13-14; Norwegian, 170
 Co-operative planning, 5-6, 86,
 150, 167
- Cotton-stamp plan, 225, 227
 Cox, 259-260
Credit-Anstalt, failure of, 214
 Crete, 95, 98, 133
 Cripps, Stafford, 73-85, 120
 Cuba, 237
 Curaçao, 143, 145
 Czechoslovakia, 131, 132, 136, 192;
 at war, 35-36; collective se-
 curity, 38-39; confederation with
 Poland, 40; democracy in, 36,
 39; and freedom, 36-38
- Daluge, 35
 Declaration of Independence, 155
 Democracy, 74-75, 88, 89, 92, 94,
 96, 97, 132, 139, 140, 169, 175,
 196, 197, 211, 227, 228, 231-236;
 in Asia, 185, 188, 189-190; in
 Czechoslovakia, 36, 39-40, 41;
 economic, 39, 179, 231; in
 France, 51, 52-53; in India, 125-
 126; political, 39, 179, 232
 Democracies, the, 13, 34, 44, 47,
 76, 119, 120, 136, 186, 211, 221,
 222, 244, 255, 257
 Democratic Convention of 1920,
 259
 Denmark, 182
 Disarmament, 10, 16, 49, 56, 63,
 92, 164, 210, 243
 Dunkirk, 133
- Eastern Europe, 39, 131, 132, 133,
 134, 135, 136, 192, 193-194, 263
 Economic collaboration, 9-10, 19-
 21, 58-59, 149-151
 Economic Defense Board, 217
 Eden, Anthony, 55-73, 77-78
 Edinburgh, 70
 Education, 26
 Egypt, 263
 Elizalde, Joaquin M., 184-190
 England, *see* Great Britain
 Equality, racial, 28, 116, 124, 162,
 207

- Essays, The*, 28-29
 Estonians, 209
 Ethiopia, 16, 34, 130, 132, 257
 Europe, 12, 16, 18, 25, 36, 38, 39, 41, 43, 55, 56, 58, 59, 60, 61, 67, 68, 71, 72, 98, 99, 100, 107, 132, 133, 150, 165, 180, 194, 204, 209, 213, 223, 224, 235, 236, 254, 257, 261
 Ever Normal Granary program, 218-219, 220
 Exploitation, 25, 26, 60, 108-110, 117, 130, 131, 133-134, 143, 158, 161, 232
 Extraterritoriality, 25, 162
 Far East, 60, 189, 255
 Fighting France: and Atlantic Charter, 48-50; and democracy, 42-43, 52-54; postwar govt. in France, 42-43; war aims, 43-44, 45-47. *See also* France
 Filov, Bogdan, 101
 Finance, international, 57, 213-216, 223
 Finland, 182, 183
 First World War, 11-12, 16, 20, 59, 62, 81, 83, 86-87, 105, 130, 173, 191, 213, 214, 217, 238, 240, 244, 246, 255, 256
 Food-stamp plan, 225, 227
Foreign Commerce, 21
 Four Freedoms, 55-56, 90, 94, 156, 189, 210-211. *See also* Freedom
 France, 12, 16, 36, 131, 132, 151, 238, 257. *See also* Fighting France
 Freedom, 41, 43, 49, 61, 77, 87, 92, 96, 97, 98, 102, 115, 119, 120, 135, 138, 154, 160, 169, 172, 185, 187, 246, 263, 264; from fear, 10, 56, 90, 134, 189, 210, 215; of speech, 14, 36, 55, 90, 124, 189, 210, 215; from want, 10, 26, 56, 90, 189, 210, 215; of worship, 14, 36, 56, 90, 124, 189, 210, 215. *See also* Four Freedoms
 Free France, *see* Fighting France
 French Empire, 46, 47, 51
 French National Committee, 42, 50, 52
 French Revolution, 86
 Frontiers, 11, 71, 135, 155, 160, 171, 177-178, 212
 Galileo, 37
 Gandhi, 121
 Gaulle, Charles de, 42-48, 50, 51
 George, Henry, 25
 Gerbrandy, Pieter S., 146-151
 Germany, 12, 15, 18, 35, 39, 43, 49, 51, 58, 59, 60, 61, 63, 67-68, 69, 84, 86, 102, 103, 117, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 152, 169, 177, 191-193, 204, 207, 213, 215, 231, 238, 255, 257
 Goebbels, 61
 Goering, 95
 Gold standard, 213, 214, 217, 222-223
 Great Britain, 12, 16, 17, 18, 20, 25, 35, 36, 48, 49, 51, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 99, 102, 103, 120, 131, 149, 151, 155, 165, 178, 204, 212, 214, 216, 218, 219, 222, 226, 236; co-operation with U.S., 63, 65, 66-67; international relations, 61-67; and a lasting peace, 67-73; postwar reconstruction, 55-61
 Greece, 103, 130, 132, 136, 192; and the Balkans, 100-102; and the League of Nations, 100; in the war, 95-98
 Greenland, 173
 Haakon, King, 170
 Hambro, Edvard, 170-183
 Harding, Warren, 259-260
 Hawley-Smoot Tariff Act, 214
 Heider, 37

- Heydrich, 35
 Hitler, 37, 38, 48, 49, 55, 67, 68, 73, 84, 86, 88, 99, 119, 130, 153, 157, 198, 199, 204, 205, 207, 209, 211, 212, 215, 222, 225, 230, 257, 263
 Holland, *see* Netherlands
 Homemade mattress program, 225
 Homer, 96
 Hoover, 231
 Hsien, 28, 29
 Huang Lichow, 28-29
 Hughes, 231
 Hull, Cordell, 57, 76, 252
 Hungary, 39, 41, 102, 135, 193

 Iceland, 173, 182
 Imperialism, 51, 132, 175, 187-188, 236, 246, 255, 262, 263
 Indemnities, 11-13, 213
 India, 92, 116, 188, 235; caste system, 121; democracy in, 125-126; Hindu-Moslem problem, 121-122; illiteracy in, 121, 123; poverty in, 121, 122-123; Princes of, 121, 122; regeneration of, 123-125; and the war, 118-120
 India League of America, 118
India Today, 118
 Indo-China, 185, 188
 Indonesia, 145
 Industry after the war, 62, 247-254
 Institute for Comparative Cultural Research, 180
 International Institute of Intellectual Co-operation, 181
 International Labor Organization, 179, 192
 International organization, 15, 17-18, 44-45, 47, 59, 62-63, 65, 93, 115-117, 147-151, 163-169, 172-183, 212, 234-235, 243, 258-262
 International Resources Organization, 80
 Iran, 205, 263
 Iraq, 263
 Isolation, -ism, 16, 18, 70, 215, 231, 234, 240-241, 254, 255, 260-262
 Italy, 102, 117, 130, 132, 152, 169, 211, 257; invasion of Ethiopia, 16

 Jagello, 191
 Japan, 25, 29, 60, 69, 117, 119, 141, 142, 151, 152, 169, 185, 188, 211, 254, 257
 Java, 185
 Jefferson, 33
 Juárez, 140
 Jugoslavia, 39, 100, 101, 130, 131, 132, 133-134, 135, 136, 192
 Julian the Apostate, 103

 Karelians, 209
 Kemal Ataturk, 100
 Khan, Muhammed Zafrulla, 104-117
 Kosanovich, Savo N., 128-136

 Labor Party, British, 85-94
 Lausanne, 100
 League of Nations, 16, 33, 93, 100, 115, 116, 146-147, 173, 177, 179, 180, 201, 202, 215, 231, 257; Covenant of, 34, 100, 147, 174, 258; and U.S., 258-260
Lebensraum, 130, 132
 Lend-Lease, 19, 65, 164, 216
 Lenin, 204, 233
 Leopold II, 22
 Letts, 209
 Liberty, 44, 45, 46, 47, 51, 52, 56, 66, 76, 90, 139, 140, 155, 199, 246. *See also* Freedom
 Lincoln, Abraham, 51, 155, 188
 Lithuanians, 209
 Litvinoff, Mme., 134
 Litvinov, Maxim, 230-231
 Living standards, 69, 77, 111-112, 113, 130, 133, 135, 154, 159, 160,

- 163, 167, 193, 196, 212, 213, 225,
239, 248, 249
- Locarno Pact, 16
- Lodge, Henry Cabot, 258
- London, 40, 60, 101, 120, 170
- London Economic Conference,
257
- Low-cost milk program, 225
- Lowden, 231
- Luxembourg, 173
- MacArthur, General, 184
- Malaya, 188
- Manchuria, 257
- Mandates System, 177
- Masaryk, Jan, 35-41
- Masaryk, Thomas, 36-37
- Mediterranean, 100, 173
- Mencius, 28
- Mexico, 140
- Michalopoulos, André, 95-103
- Middle Ages, 149
- Middle East, 98, 235, 264
- Midway Island, 66
- Milton, 96
- Mississippi, 240
- Missouri, 240
- Moldavians, 209
- Molotoff, 235-236
- Moravia, 35
- Moscow, 133
- Munich, 38
- "Munitions Assignment Board,"
165
- Mussolini, 67, 88, 130
- Nansen, Fridthjof, 180
- Nansen Office for Refugees, 180
- Narvik, 133
- Nash, Walter, 152-169
- National Congress, Indian, 122,
123-125
- Nationalism, 28
- Nazis, the, 12, 18, 41, 61, 67, 95-
96, 97, 107, 221, 228
- Nehru, 125
- Nehru: The Rising Star of India*,
118
- Netherlands, the, 16, 148, 149,
151, 173; postwar colonial pol-
icy, 142-146
- Netherlands East Indies, 141-146,
188, 214
- Neutrality, 16
- Newman, Harry W., 21
- New Order, the, 18, 37, 38, 48,
51, 56, 68, 96, 119, 132, 142, 198,
211, 228
- News from Belgium*, 17
- New Social Order, the*, 85
- Newton, 37
- New York, 192
- New Zealand, 111, 157
- North Africa, 134
- North America, 35. *See also*
America, Western Hemisphere
- North Sea, 173, 182
- Northwestern University, 170
- Norway, 36; and democracy, 174-
175, 179; and Oslo Group, 173-
174; and Scandinavia, 181-183;
small states vs. great powers,
175-177; at war, 170-171; war
aims, 171-172; and world organ-
ization, 172-173, 178-181, 183
- Norwegian Institute of Foreign
Relations, 170
- Ohio Valley, 240
- "One Man against Europe," 37
- "Origin of Rulers, The," 28
- Oslo, 180
- Oslo Group, 173
- Ottawa, Empire conference, 214
- Oxford, 73
- Pacific Charter, a, 189-190
- Pacific coast, 240
- Padilla, Ezequiel, 137-140
- Pan America, 137-140, 231
- Panchayat system, 125
- Paris, 20

- Parliament: Belgian, 13-14; British, 75, 85, 91, 198; Norwegian, 170, 175
- Parnassus, 98
- Parthenon, 103
- Pearl Harbor, 66
- People's livelihood, 28
- People's Political Council, 30
- People's rights, 28
- Perkins, Milo, 77, 247-254
- Pétain, Marshal, 42
- Philip, André, 52
- Philippines, 188; war aims, 184-187
- Pierlot, Hubert, 17
- Pireus, 95
- Plato, 37
- Poland, 34, 36, 39, 40, 51, 130, 131, 132, 135, 136; democracy in, 196-197; economic future of, 193-197; and Germany, 191-193; and System A-B, 192-193, 195
- Polish Information Service, 191
- Poverty, 29
- Prague, 35
- Quezon, Manuel, 184
- Racial discrimination, 106-108, 117, 126, 155, 159, 199, 207, 208, 233, 246
- Ramsay, Sir William, 74
- Raw materials, 9, 57, 58, 79, 80, 81, 93, 150, 154, 158, 160, 162, 165, 167, 193, 213-214, 217, 218-225, 240, 248
- Reconstruction, 5, 19, 55-61, 72, 86-94, 146-151, 161-169, 222
- Red Army, 206-208
- Reed, James A., 258
- Reformation, the, 86
- Reparations, *see* Indemnities
- Republican Convention of 1920, 259
- Rhineland, occupation of, 147, 257
- Rhodope, 98
- Rio de Janeiro, 137
- Roosevelt, Franklin D., 9-10, 13, 44, 48, 50, 55, 63, 65, 76, 78, 85, 89, 133, 156, 158, 188-189, 210-211, 215, 216, 217, 219, 229, 233
- Root, Elihu, 231
- Ropp, Stephen de, 191-197
- Rousseau, Jean Jacques, 28
- Rowell, Chester H., 260
- Rumania, 100, 135, 193
- Russia, *see* U.S.S.R.
- Russian Revolution, 234
- Scandinavia, 173, 180-183
- School-lunch program, 225
- Science in the postwar world, 73-85
- Security, 10, 15, 17, 23, 43-44, 45, 46-47, 49, 61, 76, 77, 87, 89, 115, 116, 154, 168, 241, 243; collective, 16, 39, 93, 134, 147, 175, 230; social, 10, 51, 56, 58
- Self-determination, 49, 108, 116, 189, 245
- Self-government, 9, 30, 64, 92
- Senate, U. S., 258-259. *See also* Congress, U. S.
- Shun, Emperor, 28
- Siberia, 235
- Singapore, 180
- Singh, Anup, 118-127
- Smuts, Jan Christiaan, 198-203
- Social Contract*, 28
- Socialism: in China, 27, 29-32; state, 150, 202, 232
- Socrates, 37
- Sofia, 101
- South Africa, 194, 198
- South America, 25, 56, 194, 214, 219, 224, 226, 235, 236. *See also* America, Western Hemisphere
- Southwest, the, 240
- Spain, 34, 132
- Stalin, Joseph, 204-209, 233
- Stettin, 191

- Stevenson rubber plan, 218
 Stimson, Henry L., 257
 Sun Yat-sen, 28, 29, 236
 Surinam, 143, 145
 Sweden, 182
 Syria, 263
 System A-B, 192-193, 195
- Taft, 231
 Tagore, 119
 Tariff barriers, 39, 134, 178, 213, 214, 215, 217, 224, 257
 Taygetos, 98
 Teutonic Knights, 191
 Teutons, the, 199
 Thailand, 188
 Ting, Norwegian, 174
 Tocqueville, 230
 Trade, international, 57, 64, 69, 154, 212-228
 Turkey, 100, 177, 263
- Ukrainians, 209
 United Nations, 5, 13, 19, 21, 22, 24, 35, 41, 61, 65, 67, 72, 79, 80, 81, 84, 98, 99, 100, 109, 119, 120, 133, 145, 146, 152, 155, 156, 164, 166, 169, 171, 182, 184, 186, 187, 193, 200, 201, 229, 235, 236, 243, 245
 United States, 18-19, 20, 25, 36, 39, 48, 49, 56, 58, 63, 65, 72, 76, 77, 78, 92, 97, 98, 99, 102, 103, 115, 116, 130, 131, 148, 149, 155, 157, 165, 174, 175, 178, 184, 185, 186, 187, 194; and Atlantic Charter, 243, 246; democracy in, 231-236; and First World War, 213, 238, 240; foreign policy, 254-262; history, 214-215, 237-238; isolation, 215-216, 238-241; and mass-production economy, 247-254; peace aims, 211-212, 216, 242-247, 262-264; postwar economic problems, 217-228; and Russia, 229-236; war aims, 241-242; and world organization, 212, 243-247
- University College, 74
 Uruguay, 226
 U.S.S.R., 20, 35, 36, 65, 72, 92, 116, 130, 131, 136, 151, 175, 263, 264; war aims, 204-209; and the U. S., 229-236
- Venezelos, Eleutherios, 100
 Versailles, 258; Treaty of, 130, 179
- Wallace, Henry A., 45, 77, 133, 134, 211-228, 229-236
 Washington, 219
 Weimar Republic, 196
 Welles, Sumner, 77, 237-247
 Western Hemisphere, 221, 237, 245. *See also* America, North America, South America
 Wilhelmina, Queen, 141-146
 William II, 12, 49
 Willkie, Wendell L., 254-262, 262-264
 Wilson, Woodrow, 15-16, 100, 256, 258, 259
 World Reconstruction Council, 166
- Yau, Emperor, 28
 Yü, Emperor, 28

